

THE TWO SONS OF GOD;
OR
**ADAM AND JESUS, IN THEIR RELATION TO THE
FALL AND REDEMPTION OF MAN.**

By
EDWARD TURNEY

Contents.

I.	Adam. - The Two Trees - Transgression - Blood. - Noah's Sacrifice	1
II.	Day Of Atonement - The Tabernacle Of Witness - Burnt Sacrifice	11
III.	Adam And Jesus - Sin And Disobedience - The Heir Of All Things	19
IV.	Aaron And Christ - Jezreel - Bethel - The Flesh	28
V.	In The Spirit - The Natural Man - He That Is Spiritual	38
VI.	A Precious Promise - A Rich Inheritance - A Gracious Offer	46
VII.	Ascription Of Sin To Christ - The Holy Spirit In Relation To Sinful Flesh The Seed Of The Serpent - The Woman's Seed	52
VIII.	Adoption - Born Again	61
IX.	Election	70
X.	Temptation	77
XI.	Anointing - The Enmity Slain	88
XII.	The Son Of Perdition - The Sun Of Righteousness	92
XIII.	The Old Millenium - The Old Name	98
XIV.	The Age Of Peace - The New Name	101
XV.	Recapitulation	107
	An Outline Of The Ancient Gospel	113

Preface

The work here reproduced was originally published in a monthly magazine "The Lamp" and reprinted in 1876 in book form.

While giving the best extant outline of the plan of God from the Creation to the glorious consummation there appears on some pages to be an endorsement of the wide-spread error that natural corruptibility is the result of sin, but later chapters make it clear that the author was breaking through into the light and it is to him that we are largely indebted for the realisation that Law and legal relationship are the basis of the fall and redemption of man.

When he writes (page 5) "But the return to the ground is not, strictly speaking perhaps, any part of the penalty," he has found the key to the understanding of the Atonement and subsequent study by both Edward Turney and others who followed has made apparent the inconsistency of orthodox views of the subject. It was therefore decided to reprint this work as originally written without amendations or footnotes and leave the careful reader to weigh the arguments.

Copies of the lecture "The Sacrifice of Christ" by the same author and other literature are available from the Nazarene Fellowship.

A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD

CHAPTER I.

ADAM.

By the historic light of divine truth we go back through the darkness of nearly sixty centuries to take our stand in Eden of the East. In this flight of thought the mind is crowded on every side. Countless millions of the dead flit quickly past, and all the sea and land seem one vast grave o'er which the living still tread their chequered way to the great unseen. The picture is rich with the dress of trees and flowers, but it is the drapery of a well-grown burial place.

Myriad queries press upon us. What are the things we see? What are these rocks and rivers, these forests, these fish, and birds, and beasts? Science gives each and all some dry name, and labels the elements of which they are composed. But what are those elements, whence came they; how did they assume their present shape? The latter may perhaps be answered, but the former never by children of the dust. Imagination divides and subdivides to infinity; and then a voice cries. All is spirit. Matter was spirit and may be spirit again; spirit is but another name for matter. And what is spirit? To this no answer is returned.

We have soon reached the limit of human inquiry and human discovery. We stand in dumb amazement before the boundless incomprehensible. "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." What things are clearly seen and understood? "His eternal power and Godhead." The things seen testify of their Creator and Upholder. It is the revealed only that can profit us, the contemplation of all beyond is unprofitable and vain. The first man is the object of our present interest. There is only one book to which we can turn for information. From the dark void our world had been evolved and furnished for its new inhabitant. There was no man; none to survey its wealth and beauty, none to rule its birds and beasts, its fishes and its creeping things.

It seemed fit that he who was to have dominion should be of the earth itself. Under the creative power of the Eternal it was to be the well-spring, the womb of life. It was formed to bring forth: it was made to be inhabited. The agents of Eternal power who shaped and fashioned it were commanded to complete their great labour in the making of a new being in their own image, a little lower than themselves.

We are simply told of what was about to be done, but of the secret of the work nothing is recorded. How the dust of the earth was moulded into the new creature called man it is useless to inquire. With the patriarch we can only say he was fearfully and wonderfully made. His visible and definable self is even now but imperfectly understood. When formed he was named Man. His composition was styled flesh, bone, blood, and breath. Though living and powerful he is but "a vapour." In death he ceases to be; he evaporates. He observes and thinks, but how he does not know. He differs from other living things in that he possesses an in-born sense of a Creator whom he must worship in some shape or conception. Like all other beings he dreads death. By nature he experiences no desire to leave his habitation; he clings to the earth, whence he sprang, as naturally as he clings to life.

When the Heavenly Powers had made man, the Highest pronounced him very good. It was not said he was partly good and partly bad; the judgment upon him was complete and uniform. This goodness referred to his material self, for at that time he had no more moral character than a new-born babe.

EVE.

The constitution of the man required an extension of divine power. The man was relatively imperfect. He was incomplete without the woman. The Almighty purposed to fill the earth with a population of his new-made offspring; and ordained that the work should be carried out upon a principle of mutual love. To effect this He created the woman from the man.

This production seems almost more marvellous than the formation of the man. But there are things in which we can make no comparisons; things of which we know absolutely nothing, except the terms by which their existence is conveyed to our minds. God has not thought proper to tell us more than that the man was cast into a deep sleep, his side opened, a rib severed from it, and of that rib woman was made. We may figure the man in his painless sleep; imagination sees the incision, the extraction, and the healing. From the rib the woman rises into view like magic apparitions upon the canvas, or the white sails of ships from out the haze that robes the sea, developed by the sunlight; but in reality we know nothing. Pencil and pen have traced the fancied figure of the first lord of creation and his beauteous bride; and the universal mind dwells with pleasure on the innocence and happiness of the first pair.

Looking at the father and mother of all living, we consider them as one. Their nature is the same, and also their destiny.

THE TWO TREES.

In some undiscovered spot, probably not far from Palestine, the Creator chose a garden, well watered, and planted with trees bearing fruit suitable for the sustenance of life. The genius of the prince of poets has revelled here in all the luxuries of poetic vision. But few parts, perhaps, of the panorama can be looked upon as faithful to the original.

The sacred historian bestows only a few simple words upon the scene: "A river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads. The name of the first Pison, that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good; there is bdellium and the onyx stone. And the name of the second river Gihon, the same is it which compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia. And the name of the third river Hiddekel; that is it which goeth towards the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates."

The only tree mentioned by name is the fig-tree, of whose leaves they made themselves aprons. The tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil were in the midst of the garden. We are not told what these were, it is only the moral and physical purpose of their existence that is pointed out.

It appears probable that of the first of these two trees Adam and Eve ate regularly until their expulsion from the garden, and that this eating sustained life in a remarkable degree; that so long as they continued to eat health and vigour were maintained, and the natural tendency to decay, which is inherent in corruptible bodies, was retarded; but when they ceased to eat the course of their nature proceeded gradually and brought them again to dust.

No command is given against the eating of the tree of life, but of the fruit of the tree which stood in the midst of the garden, the tree of knowledge of good and evil, of that fruit they were forbidden to eat on pain of death, not instant death, but, as is seen from what occurred, of expulsion, decay, and death, in the order of their nature.

TRANSGRESSION.

The next proceeding in this primeval drama is more suitable for the assent of faith than the progress of investigation. A few bare facts, and those of the strangest class, are set down without any sign of surprise by the narrator, and no after writers on the sacred page have added a single touch to the picture which might relieve us of this unknown difficulty, unknown in all the range of historical knowledge.

The speaking of brute beasts, but more especially their participation in high moral things, and the eternal destiny of myriads of the human race, is a phenomenon on which there may be speculation, but about which it is hardly possible to reason.

The only positive mention of the temptation by the serpent, that we recollect, is that of Paul, in which he expresses his deep anxiety for the Corinthian believers. "But I fear," he says, "lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." Whether the apostle understood what Moses had recorded in a literal or in an allegorical sense he does not say.

It would not profit our readers to transcribe the conjectures of various writers who have sought to maintain the literal or the figurative view; their fancy might be amused, but this treatise has other ends to subserve.

Moses afterwards introduced a serpent to the camp of Israel, but that was a serpent of brass, a likeness of the fiery serpents of whose bites they were dying by thousands. This was not the serpent that bit them, but it had a resemblance to it. The serpent of brass was intended to heal, not to bite. It was, therefore, not a biter, but a healer; not a poisoner, but a good physician. It was an antidote to the venom of the biter, and is understood to typify Him who was lifted up, to look upon whom in faith is to be healed of the death-wound inflicted in the garden of Eden.

Moses briefly and simply relates as a dialogue that which led to the death-sentence on every child of Adam. The world-wide and eternal mischief turns upon a deception of the understanding of the woman, half willing to be beguiled. The serpent, or whatever may be signified by it, enticed Eve to taste the fruit. She was anxious to do so, and only restrained by divine prohibition. Persuasion and appetite at length overcame law; she plucked and ate. At her instigation her husband also partook of the fruit, and being head, though second in the transgression, he is said to have brought sin into the world.

These actions were the first explanations of sin. Till then sin was a word not understood; a word, in fact, not imported into our world. Sin is henceforth defined as “the transgression of the law.”

KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL.

The eating of the forbidden tree produced an unexpected effect on the minds of Adam and Eve. The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked. This knowledge must have existed before, but it was not attended with any sense of shame, a feeling observed in all races, however primitive their habits.

The change from innocence to modesty, which takes place gradually in every individual of the human family, came, in the case of Adam and Eve, as quickly as the act that produced it. It is a moral transition which we cannot explain. The record does not tell us that they had been previously informed of this result. It is inexplicable.

A sense of nakedness naturally induced a desire for secrecy and covering. The broad tough leaf of the fig tree was employed as a rude means of hiding their persons, but, like most devices for the concealment of crime, became the evidence of its commission. The two aprons were two public notices of trespass visible to all eyes except those whose guilt they were intended to cover. Those whose deeds are evil love darkness rather than light. The first sinners sought the shade and obscurity of the thick trees of the garden; they dreaded the light of heaven, and most of all the eyes of their former companions. Their own eyes were, probably, painful to each other. The eye and the voice of justice bring trembling to the evil doer.

The short questions of the divine messengers proved the crime of Adam and his wife, and their answers confirmed the truth of the proverb - he who excuses accuses himself.

THE SENTENCE.

Death had been pronounced and probably explained when the occupants of Eden were placed under law. The loss of consciousness and resolution into dust were not however to be the sudden or immediate consequences of sin. The effect of disobedience was designed to be endured. But in death both knowledge and feeling are totally destroyed. A long life of sorrow, partly relieved by divine interposition, was the real punishment for the breach of divine law.

The man and woman were intended to replenish the earth; but no child was born in the bright days of their innocence. That clause in the judgment, threatening to greatly multiply sorrow, intimates that procreation would not have been altogether free from trouble: not only the pain, but also the conception was to be increased.

The wrath of God seems to have fallen with more severity on the woman than on the man. Adam, says Paul, was not deceived, but the woman was in the transgression. It would seem that Adam sinned from despair; rather than separately witness the judgment of God against his heart's love, he resolved to share her fate. But this heroism and devotion were not sufficient to expiate his crime. His fault was that he sinned under the full light of knowledge.

The terrors of the penalty reached him as the husband, father, and provider for his wife and family. The earth, whence he was taken, became his adversary. The rich and abundant produce which had started spontaneously from the soil was restrained and mingled with thorns and thistles. These obstacles are known in all climes where the subsistence of man depends on the cultivation of the ground. They are overcome only by daily hard toil, and the bread is won by the sweat of the brow. Man does not know why the weeds spring; but their presence reminds him of the first capital offence.

An easy tending of the garden amused the leisure and refined the taste of the first human pair; but the desire to attain by unlawful means to a higher and happier state threw them into a life-long conflict with the obstacles they had provoked.

The judgment against the serpent is brief, and not easy of explanation. The impression received by Adam and Eve from the sentence against themselves is not hard to be understood. They knew that they had been formed from the dust, and to be told that they should return to dust could leave no room for the idea of intermediate existence. Once they were not; again they were not to be. Post-mortem life, recognised throughout Europe and the world, in shrines, burning lamps, and prayers for the dead, who are pretended to be really alive, must have been absolutely unknown to the first individuals of our race. Their literal extinction was as certain as their literal existence. But the return to the ground is not, strictly speaking perhaps, any part of the penalty. The law of all corruptible bodies brings them sooner or later to their original elements: they all terminate in dust.

CHERUBIM AND FLAMING SWORD.

Part of the sentence was expulsion from the garden. We are again confronted with phenomena beyond our knowledge. The scene is altogether strange. We figure to our minds a stationary display of fire, ready to flame out to the destruction of those who should attempt to regain the lost Paradise. The tree of life was always guarded by this flaming sword. The preservation of the tree looks like a sharpening of the pains of disobedience. There, was the standing inducement to return, and the constant threatening flame against all intrusion.

The sacred historian has not said when these things ceased to be. Again we know nothing, and all inquiry and imagination are useless. It is some slight consolation to suppose that these are mysteries of which it would not be well for us to be cognisant. As little is really known of the cherubim who accompanied the flaming sword, as of the sword itself. They appear to be beings of human form, of superior power and intelligence, frequently engaged in the affairs of our world; but no farther can we go. This display of defence around the Edenic Paradise may be classed with the wonders of the burning bush, the smoking fiery summit of Sinai, and many others.

COATS OF SKINS.

The inspired penmen do not always chronicle events in the exact order of their occurrence. Moses speaks of the coats of skins before the expulsion from the Garden; but the summary dismissal from the tree of life favours the idea that God provided this covering after He had driven the sinners out. The order of these facts is perhaps not of much importance to us; the significance of the arrangement is of greater interest.

This provision of skins for the partial habiliment of Adam and Eve was a direct rejection of their own attempt. They would discern in it that their own scheme was displeasing to God, and totally unfit for the object in view. That object was not merely the hiding of parts of their bodies, else fig leaves or any other garment might have answered the purpose. Neither fig leaves, nor skins, nor the shades of darkest night could conceal the shame of sin. No plan but that designed by Him against whom they had trespassed could bring one spark of relief and consolation to their guilty minds.

The skin robes are not to be considered as articles of dress, but as types of God's means for the covering of moral nakedness. In this light we see the impossibility of acceptance with God in an unclothed condition; and all are unclothed, whatever may be their investiture, unless clothed with the garment provided by the Almighty for their covering.

Besides these considerations the coats of skins imply the death of the animals to which they belonged. This is the first instance of the shedding of blood in connection with the recognition and forgiveness of sins; for, after the conditions of Heaven had been obeyed, a sense of satisfaction would ensue. From the subsequent teaching on sacrifices it may be safely concluded that the animals whose skins furnished the coats of Adam and Eve were lambs or kids; types of the divine Lamb appointed for the purifying and covering of all who would find favour in the sight of God.

The coats of skins were not worn over the aprons of fig leaves. These were first put off; and that preliminary act would signify the putting away of sin. This implies repentance and sorrow for their crime. The putting on of the coats made by God signified their reinstatement in divine favour; it indicated their provisional righteousness, and gave hope that the tree of life might yet become accessible. The cherubic flames reminded them that no transgressor unforgiven could taste its fruit, such having no right to enter the paradise of God.

If the first sin had been unpardonable, no covering would have been appointed; no atonement made. The sentence, "Ye shall surely die," gives inference that continued obedience would have been rewarded by translation, and avoidance of the dark valley of the shadow of death. But certain death is not necessarily eternal death. No way of escape was made for Korah and his company; the cities of the plain also suffer the vengeance of eternal fire. Adam was on probation in two conditions: the first trial began in innocence; the second under repentance and pardon.

BLOOD.

The shedding of blood and the pardon of sin are made fast in one indissoluble bond, essential in their relationship. This inevitable connection was before the apostle, when he reminded the Hebrew saints that almost all things under Moses' law were purged with blood, and that without the shedding of blood there is no remission. To spill blood in sacrifice is to give life, for the life of all flesh is in the blood thereof. To purge with blood is to blot out the stain of sin; that is, to obliterate in death. Its application washes out the spots of transgression and confers the right to new life. Hence, when this has been accomplished, the washed and sanctified person is exhorted to keep himself unspotted from the world.

The loss of life is a literal fact; the giving of life as a ransom by the shedding of blood is a literal fact also; but the application of that blood to the mind and heart of man born in sin is an act of faith; therefore the just are said to live by faith.

Every offering to be efficacious must be clean. To bring an unclean offering was an abomination in the sight of God. There were two classes of animals, the clean and the unclean; of the latter mankind in every age have been forbidden by the Almighty to bring sacrifices to Him. If the typical offerings were so jealously guarded, how much more the anti-type; and to every mind it must occur that the clean makes clean, but the unclean defiles.

Nothing is unclean of itself. But the distinction made by Jehovah points to the fact that no offering which is legally unclean can cleanse a subject who is legally defiled. All those beasts and birds legally appointed by Jehovah for sacrifice were specially described, and to bring any other was to add sin to sin. But the physical nature of the unclean animals was quite as good as the physical nature of the clean animals: they were all very good.

It was not physical but legal defilement for which man needed to atone; it was not for any violation of his material self that he sought pardon; but it was for a breach of Jehovah's law. The breach of law did not make man constitutionally worse, nor does the observance of law make him constitutionally better. His relationship to the future purpose of his Maker is changed; but he himself as a created being remains the same.

It was not to remedy any inherent or contracted defect of nature that the scheme of atonement was designed; it was to provide for an entirely new nature; a putting off and a putting on. The Almighty is not like man; He does not require to improve His work: all He makes is perfect of its kind; but there are various kinds, and the higher we ascend in the scale of creation the more exalted is the work which meets our view.

In relation to this globe man was the last work of the Creator and the noblest. From invisible spirit, condensed by Omnipotence through untold ages, to rude rocks and mighty depths, from tiny herbs to towering forests; from the first shades and forms of life through all the terrors and grandeurs of myriad grades, we mark the measured pace, the increasing beauty, and the boundless wisdom of His works whose ways are past finding out.

CAIN AND ABEL.

The first child born represented the disobedience and ingratitude of his parents. As a tiller of the ground Cain's profession was a daily memorial of the anger of the Lord. Cain was the first murderer; the type of the majority of mankind, a hater of his brother. Abel is a specimen of the God-fearing few who, like himself, have been ever since, the envy and prey of the other class. Christ seems to allude to Cain when he rebuked the Jews as being of their father the devil, a murderer from the beginning.

Cain was not willing to recognise his sinful state inherited by birth, nor to offer blood as an evidence of hereditary and personal guilt. Like all envious and selfish men, he reserved the choicest things for himself, and presented to God as little as he could of that which cost him least. The collateral obedience and goodness of his brother increased his wicked disposition, and at length he conceived a plan for getting rid of his hateful presence and example. The first murder struck two discordant strings which will vibrate through all time: sympathy for Abel and abhorrence for Cain.

The fruit of the ground was good to bring before the Lord; but it was not enough. It could not speak of sin and death; it pointed to no life as a price for redemption. Abel brought more than this. He spared not the choicest of his flocks and herds, and was rewarded with the answer of a good conscience towards God. "And the Lord had respect unto Abel and his offering." Alan had offended God, but God had not left man without a way of reconciliation. He had blessed him with those things suitable to find acceptance in His presence: all the goodness and the mercy were His.

Cain refused to take one of those animals which lay at the door of his fold. No blood of sacrifice spoke to God in favour of Cain; but the blood of Abel cried unto the Lord. This is mentioned in two places, Gen. iv. 10 and Heb. xii. 24. The latter passage draws a comparison between the blood of Abel and the blood of Jesus. "And to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

There can be no comparison between things totally different. For one thing to be said to be better than another, it is necessary for the two things to be of the same kind, and to be intended for the same use. The blood which flowed from Abel's veins when Cain slew him, was not sacrificial blood. It did not speak good things but bad. Comparison lies between good and better, not between bad and better; the inference is then that Paul referred to the blood of Abel's offering. This brought down the respect of the Lord; but could not finally remove transgression. The better things belonged to the blood of God's lamb who taketh away the sin of the world.

NOAH'S SACRIFICE.

Two thousand years had produced a population of rebels against the government of Heaven. The earth was filled with violence; all flesh had corrupted His way. The Almighty resolved to destroy man and beast, and to begin afresh the work of peopling the world. Divine forbearance has its limits, and that limit was passed by the scoffers of Noah while, for one hundred and twenty years, he preached righteousness and prepared the ark for the safety of himself and family.

At the end of one hundred and fifty days the waters abated, and the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat. The first work of Noah, after emerging from the ark, was to build an altar unto the Lord, and to take of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl,

and offer burnt offerings on the altar. This event added a new link to the chain which bound man to acknowledge his proper standing in the eyes of his Maker. The clean sacrifices again pointed onward with the finger of hope to that Divine Offering without blemish and without spot. The Almighty expressed His pleasure at this act: we read that “The Lord smelled a sweet savour, and the Lord said in His heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake. While the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease. And God blessed Noah, and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you, and the dread of you, shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered.”

After this declaration, which placed Noah in a position similar to that of Adam, Jehovah repeated His injunctions with regard to blood. He then chose the rainbow as a token of peace between Himself and the creatures of His hand.

THE OFFERING OF ISAAC.

At the advanced age of seventy-five, Abraham departed out of Haran and came into the land of Canaan. He is one of those Bible characters who has left a more distinct impression on the world’s heart than all the heroes of profane history. The sacred record is remarkable for this, its figures never fade.

A small group of Old and New Testament celebrities, with the peerless Nazarene for the central star, has been, and will ever be vividly before mankind. The best stories, the most thrilling facts outside the Bible, have but lightly struck the chords of human joy and pity; but the tones are deep and ceaseless that echo from the lyre touched by the sacred hand. The sale of Joseph, the meeting with ‘his brethren; the fiery furnace; the prophet thrown to the lions, are written for all time. The offering up of Isaac holds a high place in these unfading memories.

During the long period of Abraham’s sojourn in Canaan and in the Philistine’s land, his faith had been severely tried. He was now sinking under the weight of years; Isaac, the child of his old age, the special gift of God, born to him out of due time, sweetened his declining days, and promised to continue the honour of his house. Abraham might now have walked gently down the hill and rested in dreamless sleep in the still dark valley of death to await the promised seed whose voice should break the silence of the ancient graves.

But the Almighty had a new and crowning trial in store to test the faith of His friend. He commanded him to slay and burn his only son! “Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains that I will tell thee of.”

The narrator records no hint of question or hesitation. Abraham had once presumed to ask the Almighty for some sign by which he might know that He would fulfil His word. The sign was given: a burning lamp passed between the pieces of his sacrifice, and in a deep sleep the fortunes of his unborn sons passed before him in vision. His trust in the Almighty was implicit and unwavering.

“He rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him, and Isaac his son; and he took the fire in his hand, and a knife.” Who can describe the old man’s feelings through the previous and two following nights! He suppressed his anguish, the beloved lad went in cheerful innocence like a lamb to the slaughter. “They went both of them together. And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he said: Behold the fire and the wood; but where is the lamb for a burnt offering? And Abraham said: My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering; so they went both of them together.”

Abraham is the only instance of a resemblance to the Father of Jesus Christ, each offering up his only son whom he loved.

“And they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the altar upon the wood.” The implicit obedience of Isaac was equal to the firm faith of his father, and cast a well-defined shadow of the meekness and obedience of the true lamb.

“And Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son. “There can be no doubt he would have struck the blow had not the angel of the Lord called to him to stay his hand, and to do the lad no harm. “Now I know,” said the angel, “that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me.”

That moment a heavy load fell from Abraham’s heart, and at the same instant he realised the pleasant reward of unbounded trust in God. It is usual to regard Isaac as a type of Christ; but in the apostle’s notice of this circumstance in Hebrews he neither affirms nor denies it. His comment shows that the offering was a means employed by the Almighty to prove the faith of Abraham; and this agrees with a portion of the passage already quoted from Genesis. We do not think Isaac typical of Christ as an offering. Isaac, though bound and laid on the altar, was not offered in reality; he was only offered in the obedient purpose of his father’s heart. This thought is suggested by the fact that there is not a single example of an offering being ordained by Jehovah of any individual already under sentence of death as Isaac was, being a son of Adam; and also by the fact that he was not really slain. Isaac may have fore-shadowed the intention of God to make a human being the means of atonement; but, if so, this was done without slaying him as a typical sacrifice.

It is an easy matter to find, or rather to make, allegories and correspondences; but the safest plan is to keep close to those already made by the New Testament writers. Departure from this rule has produced a well-known volume largely filled with human fancies . While perhaps few of our readers would assent to any of these correspondences, it is not out of place to intimate the need of caution, lest from another point of view we also fall into the same extreme.

The firmness of the patriarch was founded in the belief that God was able to raise up Isaac, even from the dead; “from whence also,” Paul adds, “he received him in a figure.” It is true that to Abraham’s mind his son was as good as dead; but it has been suggested by some writers that Paul’s allusion was not to this; but that it was to the extraordinary conditions of Isaac’s birth.—Rom. iv. 19.

CHAPTER II.

THE GREAT DAY OF ATONEMENT.

The Tabernacle of Witness - The Sanctuary - The Candlestick, the Table and the Shew Bread. - The Second Veil - The Holy of Holies - Burnt Sacrifice - The High Priest’s Offering - The Two Goats

Among the advantages, specified by Paul, which the Jews had over the Gentiles, were “the giving of the law, the service of God, and the promises.” These gifts enabled the intelligent and faithful of that generation, contemporary with the preaching of Christ and His Apostles, to apprehend with greater facility the meaning of Christ’s mission. They had, as Paul says in another place, “the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.” The devoutly studious would, after these lessons in outline, so to speak, more readily fill in the rest of the picture, while the Gentiles must needs be taught the very first forms and figures of the truth.

Multifarious as were the Jewish rites, the whole system rested on several principal ordinances, the most striking probably of all was the national sin-offering, on the tenth day of their seventh month. The lines of this shadow must be distinct even to the minds of those students of Moses who never saw the ceremonies of that great day of blood. But to such as had witnessed the offerings, the solemn pomp, and joy of that day, and then recognised, as did those three thousand Jews on the day of Pentecost, that in Jesus all was fulfilled, the remembrance of the shadowy rite must have returned with an effect not easy to describe by words.

One grand mistake was rectified on that day. The Jews had esteemed the offerings of the day of atonement sufficient for the accomplishment of the object to which they only pointed, namely, the forgiveness of sin. The great obstacle, therefore, in the way of their receiving a crucified Messiah made it nationally well nigh impossible for them to accept Jesus.

In the eye of the nation every part of the decree from Sinai was perfect: it was no type or herald of better things; but complete and final. The result was that the harshest ideas were formed of remission of sins by human sacrifice, and, above all, by such a sacrifice consisting of God's well-beloved Son.

This particular trait of Jewish thought seems to be continued to the present day by the followers of Socinus, to whom nothing appears more objectionable than the slaying of a good son to put away the trespass of all those who by "one offence were made sinners." And it is remarkable that none have been under so much necessity to depart from the universally acknowledged canon of Scripture as they. As with the Jews, prophecy must be mutilated, and much of the New Testament, if not all as with them, is rejected.

The one idea that remains is God. He, as a kind Father, naturally inspires brotherly kindness among His children; and out of this thought flow excellent lessons of morality. Beyond this, nothing is safe or desirable. The idea of an after existence, in or out of the body, of any forms of worship, of approaching God through His Son as a mediator - all these things are discarded, or at least held lightly, as matters of theological speculation, attended with little or no profit.

But, enlightened by the Scripture, we find pleasure in regarding the things enacted aforetime, as written for our learning.

THE TABERNACLE OF WITNESS.

This construction of boards, curtains, and skins is the first place of abode occupied by the Eternal Spirit among men. Here Jehovah may, be said to have walked and dwelt upon the earth. His residence, however, was only temporary, and, as we gather from other portions of the Word, typical of an eternal dwelling among the glorified sons of Adam. "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God." Rev. xxi. 8.

Viewing the tabernacle as the dwelling place of the Almighty, seems to resemble an ordinary house, being furnished with food, drink, light, and other things, in which those permitted to abide with Him were allowed to share. This idea seems to bring God near to man, to create a kind of equality and friendship: that sort of equality and friendship which subsists between a father and his children. It is productive of love rather than of fear; of affection and trust rather than of awe and dread. This is the spirit of the relationship seen between Jesus and His Father when Jesus was on earth; it is also exactly the spirit of that relationship which He so beautifully illustrated in His parables. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give good things unto them that ask Him?"

It was the Jewish nation, says Dean Stanhope, that God intended the tabernacle for, as an emblem of the whole world; the outward, representing the earth and sea, the inward heaven; the former as sensible and familiar; the latter invisible and as yet inaccessible to us. Whence some have thought the title, "a worldly sanctuary," to have been given to it here.

THE SANCTUARY.

This is the name given by Paul to the holy place, or first enclosure. The veil which divided this compartment from the Holy of Holies the apostle styles "the second veil," because there was another veil which formed the entrance from the court to the Holy. The priests went regularly into this for the performance of worship; but beyond the second veil none were permitted to pass but the high priest, and he only once a year, that is, on the great Day of Atonement.

It is not, however, to be understood that the high priest entered the holiest of all only once on that day; his duties required him to go in several times. The once refers not to the number of times he went in, but to the one day on which he was to enter. He first entered with a censer of burning coals, and his hands full of sweet incense: the incense he placed upon the fire so that when the cloud of smoke rose up it covered the mercy-seat. He then took some of the blood of the bullock slain outside, and sprinkled it seven times before the mercy-seat, besides putting some of it upon the mercy-seat. He then went out to kill the goat, and afterwards came in again to do likewise with his blood.—Lev. xvi. 12—15.

Paul says this “was a figure for the time then present.” We naturally ask, A figure of what? And the answer will come just as readily as the question - A figure of Christ’s house. Moses and his house were typical of Christ and His house, “whose house are we if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.”

It is to be observed that the things which constituted this great “figure” were no figure at all before they were sanctified. When the workmen had finished them, and all was ready, no worship could be performed until the whole had been judicially cleansed. After this ceremony the whole was legally clean, whereas before, it was legally unclean. These types were no more fit for divine use before cleansing, than mankind at large are fit to be styled Christ’s house, not having been purged with His blood. The important conclusion which follows is, that all the shadows of Moses’ house foretold that He who was the substance thereof was to be “holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners.”

THE CANDLESTICK, THE TABLE, AND THE SHEW BREAD.

These are the principal things which belonged to the Sanctuary. Looking upon the tabernacle as a house, the articles enumerated by Paul are consistent with that idea.

There can be but one idea attached to a candlestick, namely, that of giving light. Not that God needed any light in His dwelling; but that those who were to approach Him and to dwell with Him could only do so by means of light, and that of His own ordaining. It may be profitably observed that the oil burnt was “pure olive.”

The greatest care was taken as to the purity and perfection of all that entered into that house, which Paul has taught us to look upon as “a shadow of good things to come.” Jesus declared Himself to be the true Light. He is also represented as standing in the midst of the Seven Churches of Asia, symbolized by seven candlesticks. And those who walk in His steps are said to walk in the light.

The table set with unleavened bread is suggestive of regular meals. Ordinary bread is said to be the staff of life: and the teaching of Paul clearly proves that this Mosaic shew bread was figurative of a perpetual subsistence, or feast upon “the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.” It is also indicative of the presence of God, being called the bread of presence.

Christ, in whom there was no leaven of sin, and in whom the Father was ever present by His Spirit, answers to this unleavened bread. The Father dwelt both in shadow and substance, in a clean, or holy place, “I and my Father are one: I in Him and He in me.” Under Moses, all must be cleansed before they were allowed to be partakers; under Christ, all must be made “clean through the word” before they are allowed to be partakers of Him in a spiritual or figurative sense. This idea of cleanness cannot be too strongly insisted upon, for we find that it runs through every detail of the typical economy.

THE SECOND VEIL.

We have inspired authority for the belief that the veil was a type of Christ’s body, that is to say, His flesh. Once a year the high priest drew aside the veil in order to carry fire, incense, and blood up to the mercy-seat, to present them before Jehovah. But after this the veil returned to its original position, shrouding the glory of God.

All this, Paul declares, was intended by the Holy Spirit to signify that “the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing.” As a confirmation of the truth of this, when the body of Christ was pierced with the Roman spear and torn with the nails, “the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.”

The way of approach to the Divine presence was not merely by passing from one side of the curtain to the other, it was by blood. Without blood there was no admission, therefore the blood was accounted to be the way. Aaron carried the blood of the bullock and the goat in a basin to sprinkle it upon and before the ark. But when this was done the victims were dead. Upon this circumstance the apostle makes an important observation. He points out that, in drawing nigh to God “by the blood of Jesus,” we approached “by a newly slain yet living way.” (The first clause of Hebrews x. 20 is more correctly rendered thus).

Here is the superiority of the substance to the shadow. The typical victim by which Israel, after the flesh, entered the Holy of Holies was dead; the victim by which Israel, after the spirit, entered the holiest of all, was living. If, however, a rigidly exact counterpart were looked for it would make Christ no better than the Mosaic way. Moreover, the high priest took the blood of the victim into the Holy of Holies, but Jesus did not take His blood there: He entered Heaven itself by means of His own blood, being raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father.

It has been reasonably conjectured that the blue and purple of the Mosaic veil had typical reference to the cleansing power, and to the royalty of Him who is the substance. But neither the cleansing power nor the royalty could be said to be literally present as part of Christ's body. Though men are spoken of as washed and cleansed through His blood, nobody imagines that this is literally the fact. The blood of Jesus being legally clean has power, when scripturally applied, to purge those who are legally unclean. It is not a question of flesh, as we have elsewhere said, it is a question of law.

We speak of royal blood; but this signifies no difference at all in the quality of the blood; all the difference that exists lies in its legal value. While legally or lawfully royal, it is precisely the same as the blood of the meanest slave with regard to its constitution; it is simply human blood made regal by law.

The blood of a Jew is constitutionally identical with that of a Gentile; but in the eye of Divine law the Jews were a royal nation, a holy people. Jesus was a Jew, and His blood was just the same, constitutionally, as the blood of any other Jew, or of any Gentile. But by Heaven's decree it was blood royal. With respect to sin, however, no mere decree could make that sinless which is constituted sinful by unchanging law. It was therefore needful for God Himself to be the Father of Jesus, in order to bring the Redeemer into the world free from the effect of Adam's guilt, so that He might be at once the Just and the Justifier.

Is it not then more reasonable to say that the Christ stood related to sin; stood related to cleansing; stood related to royalty; than it is to say that sin was in Him; which would also make it necessary to say that cleansing and royalty were in Him too? Though "undefiled and separate from sinners," He held the same relation to the denied and to sinners that we behold in a sin-offering; but if we push this connection farther, then, we make Him an offering of sin for sin, instead of a spotless sacrifice for the transgressions of His people.

THE HOLY OF HOLIES.

The Holiest of all is the name given to this chamber by Paul. The whole court or principal enclosure was holy, but the superlative, or highest degree, was attained by passing through this and the first chamber of the Mosaic Tent into the small room furnished with the Ark of the Covenant, the golden pot, Aaron's rod, the tables of the covenant, and the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat.

When the apostle was drawing a general comparison between these things and Christ he could not "speak particularly" of each. He does not, however, thereby prohibit us from considering them by the aid of the scriptures.

Commentators in general have seized upon the fact that Jesus is said to have been our forerunner in entering within the veil to show that God intends us to enter into heaven. The inference is by no means devoid of plausibility. A forerunner is one who goes before those who are intended to follow, and as Jesus has ascended into heaven it is concluded that His disciples are also to go there.

But the apostle drew his comparison from the custom of Aaron entering within the veil. Here it is to be remarked that no countenance is given to the supposition that the people of Israel were to go in after him. It does not therefore follow that though Christ is gone into heaven we are to follow Him in person. The Israelites followed their high priest into the holiest with their prayers: we also follow our High Priest in like manner into the presence of God in heaven; while in person, as was the case with Israel, we remain without.

Locality is of little importance. God has not informed us that He has designed to benefit man by changing his abode, but by changing his state. Paul looked forward with joy not to a transfer from earth to heaven, but to the putting off of the mortal and to the putting on of the immortal body. If the figures under the old economy were typical of place, no advantage would accrue to us; but as types of state they are indeed a shadow of good things. To lift man from earth to sky would not necessarily change his physical structure,

but to exalt him from corruption to incorruption, in any locality known to us, would be an inestimable blessing. Man has no reasonable grounds to desire a better place than the earth; all his longings point to a change of nature. We therefore regard the figures of the Jewish economy as typical of state, not of place.

BURNT SACRIFICE.

This name was given to a particular kind of offering because the animal presented was to be wholly consumed without reserve. Calmet says that the Jews appear to have had three sorts of sacrifices:—1st. The burnt offering. 2nd. The sacrifice for sin, or sacrifice of expiation for the purification of a person who had fallen under an offence against the law. 3rd. The peace offering, or sacrifice of thanksgiving, by which devout thanks were returned to God for benefits received.

Burnt sacrifices are the most ancient of all, they are spoken of by heathen as well as by Jewish writers. The Greek historian Zenophon says that burnt oxen were offered to Jupiter, and horses were burnt in sacrifice to the Sun.

There have been various opinions as to the precise intention of burnt offerings, some supposing them to do honour to the Almighty as the preserver of all; others to expiate evil thoughts: but we may safely say, with Dr. Jennings, that they all had a typical significance, directing the faith of Old Testament believers to that only true atoning sacrifice which the Son of God was to offer in due time.

The book of Leviticus is chiefly occupied in describing the service and sacrifices of the tabernacle, and from that it derives its name. The first chapter opens with Jehovah's directions to Moses concerning burnt sacrifices: "Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them. If any man of you bring an offering unto the Lord, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock. If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish, he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord."

The animal victim could, of course, have no will in the matter. But the offerer must see that the beast was every way suitable, and it must be offered in a perfectly voluntary manner. If there were any blemish in the beast, or if the person who brought it to the priest for sacrifice, were at all reluctant or hesitant, then there was no atoning power attached to the offering. These considerations are of great moment when we look forward from the shadow to the substance.

The Almighty had strictly appointed certain kinds of animals for sacrifice, specifying that each was to be clean and perfect of its kind. Any departure from this injunction on the part of the Jews was a capital offence. But the Gentiles, who imitated the Jews in their sacrifices, took of all kinds, clean or unclean, just as they considered them to be of value to themselves, inferring, as Dean Spencer remarks, that what they prized most would be most acceptable to their deities.

To sacrifice to God an unclean thing was the same as to go into His presence in a sinful state, after He had graciously provided the means to wash and be clean.

When the priest had carefully examined the beast at the door of the tabernacle, the person who brought it was directed to lay his hand on A head, by which act, says Veysie, he acknowledged his own guilt, and prayed that it might be punished in the victim upon which his sand was laid. And accordingly we find in the rabbinical writers a art form of prayer, which, according to them, was always used on this occasion. In this form the delinquent acknowledges his offence, professes his repentance, and concludes with a petition that the victim upon which he laid his hand might be his expiation.

THE HIGH PRIEST'S OFFERING.

This was the beginning of the great work of yearly expiation made on the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish calendar. On this day the high priest was dressed, not in his grand robes of office, with his ephod, breastplate, chains, and bells, but in his garments of white linen. These were typical of the perfect righteousness of the world's Great High Priest, Jesus the Christ, and also more in harmony with the solemn ceremonies of repentance than the full dress worn on other occasions. They are described by Moses as "the holy linen coat, the linen breeches, the linen girdle, and the linen mitre."

The unblemished bullock was now slain, and some of the life-blood caught in a bowl in the hand of the high priest. He also took his censer full of burning coals from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense. He passes within the veil, and “for a little while” is hid from all without. He is there concealed making expiation for himself and all his house, which seems to include the whole tribe of Levi.

The Divine glory resting inside this otherwise dark chamber; its singular and majestic furniture; the shadowing wings of the cherubim upon the lid of the ark, the golden jar, containing a little of the manna that fell day by day for forty years; Aaron’s rod that budded; the two tables which Moses brought down from Sinai inscribed with the finger of God; the high priest in his snow white dress with beard falling to the waist, holding in one hand the smoking censer, in the other the bowl of steaming blood; the thousands of Israel all standing without in breathless silence, with their white tents circling around for miles, make a picture of solemn and imposing grandeur.

Having sprinkled the blood upon the mercy-seat he emerges from the Divine presence, passes through the holy place, in which is no man beside him, and immediately presents himself cleansed and accepted of God, in the sight of all Israel.

Besides the sins of his household, the high priest was obliged to atone for his own sins. This was one of the imperfections of the Mosaic system, not that the system was imperfect, but that it was inefficient to accomplish the object attained by the Christian High Priest; it was imperfect in the sense that all shadows are imperfect in comparison with the corresponding substances.

But Christ had no sins of His own to expiate. He is, both by the prophets and the apostles, declared to be sinless. His expiation therefore was only for His house. Some writers say that the high priest made three distinct confessions on the day of atonement, one for himself; the second for the other priests, upon the bullock; and the third for all Israel, on the scape goat.

The prayers of holy men. mentioned in the Bible, are remarkable for their full and frequent confession of sins; both their own and those of their nation, but in all that we read concerning the prayers of Christ, nothing of the kind appears. The obvious reason is that He had nothing to confess, nothing to deplore concerning Himself.

THE TWO GOATS.

These were two parts of one offering. They were both presented before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. The ceremony of easting lots was then gone through, and the goat on which the Lord’s lot fell was offered for a sin-offering. When he had killed the goat Aaron took the blood in a bowl and went again into the Holy of Holies and sprinkled it upon and before the mercy-seat seven times, in sign of that perfect sprinkling of the heart by faith with the blood of Jesus.

The carcasses of the goat and bullock were afterwards conveyed outside the camp and utterly burnt. This part of the ceremony Paul intimates was typical of the suffering of Jesus without the gate of Jerusalem. With the blood of these sacrifices Aaron made an atonement for the tabernacle, the altar, and the holy place. This was done in consequence of the uncleanness, the iniquities, and the transgressions of the children of Israel during the past year. It was not to foreshadow any natural or physical defect, or imperfection in Jesus.

We are then informed, that when the high priest had made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he brought the live goat, and Aaron laid both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confessed over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and sent him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness. And the goat bore upon him all the iniquities into a land not inhabited, or, as the expression also signifies, a land of separation.

This part of the work was of most striking significance. Although the goat bore the sins of the whole nation on his head, he was allowed to escape alive. Death followed at once on the first goat which foreshadowed the death of the Great Sin Bearer; He also, like the scape goat, took away the sins of the

people into “a land of separation,” that is, the grave, which effectually separates the living from the dead; from this, in agreement with the typical goat, He escaped alive.

Exactly where the scape goat was sent is not known. The Jews affirm that the locality was called the wilderness of Izak, ten miles from Jerusalem. They also state that, at the end of each mile, a tent was fixed, and that meat and drink were provided for the man who conducted the goat, for fear he should faint. At the end of the journey the goat was led to the top of a rock and let go to carry the sins of the nation away out of sight.

CHAPTER III.

ADAM AND JESUS.

Sin and Disobedience - Love and Death - The Heir of all things.

These are the two Sons of God in a particular manner; the one, formed direct from the dust of the earth, the other, begotten by Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary.

It is unsafe to strain the scriptures for types and correspondences; such procedure is suggestive of too great an eagerness to sustain some preconceived idea. But to pass over those persons and things, declared by the inspired writers of the New Testament to be types and shadows, would be to neglect a valuable portion of the Word intended for our instruction.

The Apostle Paul has definitely stated that Adam was a figure of Christ, “the figure of Him that was to come.” - Rom. v. 14. Now a figure, as Paul remarks in another place, is not to be taken as “the very image of the thing;” we must not, therefore, look for everything in Adam which we see in Christ, nor for everything in Christ which we see in Adam. This is a little study for the exercise of our discrimination. The object to be aimed at is to regard Adam in his typical capacity as nearly as possible as Paul viewed him. One essential to the attainment of this end is, in our opinion, to keep close to the facts concerning both characters. Inference is not altogether inadmissible in the case; but if we can seize upon the facts themselves, or even the principal part of them, and look at them in a clear light, this will be less open to objection than inference, however well-grounded it may appear to be.

Adam is presented to us in two phases. His life is divided into two grand periods; the first, the period of innocence; the second, the period of guilt. We might say three instead of two; the third being that period of time after the Almighty had pardoned his sin and covered him with the “coat of skins.”

We now enquire, In which of these did Adam represent Jesus; in all three or in two of the three, and if not, in which of the three? Luke styles Adam the son of God. This agrees with the account given by Moses that “The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.” This “living soul” was the first human son of God, of whom the Bible furnishes a record. The phrase, “son of God,” seems to imply a resemblance to God; and Adam is declared to have been made after the likeness and image of his Creator.

Thus far the parallel between the two sons of God, that is to say, between the testimony concerning them is sufficiently plain. Jesus was the son of God; and the scripture saith He was the express image of His Father’s person. Miraculous powers did not constitute Jesus the Son of Deity. He possessed none of these before His baptism; and it is needless to remark that He obeyed His Father’s will as perfectly before as afterwards.

We are viewing Adam and Jesus, for the present, simply in the relation of type and antitype, as sons of God; and thus far it appears the resemblance is very close. Both receive their life and law direct from the Deity; there is neither difference in character, nor difference in nature. Adam, in the period during which we are now considering him, displayed the glory of his heavenly Father; he obeyed His will; he was endowed

with His wisdom; he was a living, tangible reflex of God. But though a created, he was not a begotten son; the reason for this dissimilarity will appear as we proceed.

The gospel of John is remarkable for its wide variation in style from that of the other three; and one of its peculiarities is the frequency with which we are told that Jesus did not His own will but the will of Him that sent Him. There is one observation upon this which every thoughtful reader will, probably, make for himself. The statement seems to imply very clearly that Jesus had a will of His own, and that that will would, if followed out, have been contrary to the will of God. What we mean by God's will is the law which God gave to Jesus for His guidance. It is written that "He heard and learned of the Father." By the will of Jesus we mean His natural inclinations as a man. It is recorded that He was tempted in all things like His brethren; and that He suffered, being tempted.

The will of the flesh unrestrained is at variance with the will of God. When checked and guided by the Divine mind, man reflects his • Maker. It had been quite as easy for God to constitute man perfect, in the sense of creating him without those propensities and desires which led him to think and act contrary to God's will; but it pleased the Almighty so to frame man, that he might have some share in the work and honour of his own exaltation. This exaltation is primarily the work of God, and without the primary no secondary work of man could avail anything; but in co-operation, the great and glorious end is achieved. It were as unreasonable to overlook or ignore this secondary work, as it were sinful and blasphemous to disregard the primary. On this principle the glory of God is manifest, and also the glory of man. The glory of God is seen in the unspeakable honour and wisdom and riches He deigns to bestow upon the creature, man; the glory of man is seen in his obedience to God.

As respects this matter of will and law, Adam was plainly a figure of Jesus. It is contrary to reason, and contrary to scripture also, to regard the moral condition of Adam and the moral condition of Jesus as being like that generally believed to obtain among the angels. The very constitution of Adam and the purpose of the Most High leave us no doubt that his lot under law was a scene of sharp trial. There must have been times when Adam felt himself much troubled and tempted. He would be sometimes well within the limit, at others dangerously close to it. This is the experience of all men in relation to moral law; whether it be the law of their nature arising out of the moral powers which distinguish them from the beasts, or whether it be a law received from God by revelation. Adam was no exception to "every man who when he is tempted is drawn away of his own lusts." To suppose otherwise would be to destroy the main part of God's scheme, and reduce law and obedience to a mockery.

SIN AND DISOBEDIENCE.

The possibility of rendering obedience to Divine law is established from the beginning. It is just as possible for man to obey God now as it was for our first parents to obey Him in the Garden of Eden. The constitution of man is precisely the same now as then; he has no desires now which he had not then, that is to say, he has not lost any of his old or first faculties, neither has he acquired any new ones. If any of his natural appetites, being aroused, are found too strong for him, that is clearly no crime, unless he has the means of altogether avoiding the temptation. If man cannot obey, the law of obedience is a nullity.

A mistake is sometimes made in supposing all sin to be alike. Sins of ignorance are not acts of disobedience; they do not occur from a criminal fault on man's part. A Jew, for example, might walk over a grave and thereby become legally defiled, but it would be wrong to esteem that a criminal act. If, after the Jew had been made aware of his position, he refused to comply with the law of purification, he would then be a disobedient person. To set the heinousness of sin in a strong light, the Almighty ordained sacrifices for sins of ignorance, but He did not regard such sins as disobedience.

Sin is defined in the scriptures as "the transgression of law." Sin, then, is transgression. But we have the phrase, "transgression and disobedience." These are not necessarily the same. The Jew who commits a sin of ignorance is a transgressor in the first sense of the word, but he is not therefore guilty of an act of disobedience. But if, when such transgression comes to his knowledge, he refuses to offer the appointed sacrifice, he is then guilty of a sin of disobedience.

There is no law in the Word of God to punish with death for a sin of ignorance; such law could only come against the ignorant sinner because he refused to recognise such sin when it became known to him, in

the appointed way. Though seemingly very simple, this is really a matter of great importance to the Christian. Rightly understood, it shows him plainly that he can keep God's commandments, and that he need not feel condemned for what he does amiss in the integrity of his heart.

Adam's sin, in relation to all posterity, may be considered a sin of ignorance; but that sin having been brought to our knowledge, if we refuse to avail ourselves of the only means of atonement, we are guilty of disobedience. As a further confirmation of this view, we may observe that an untrue statement is not inevitably a lie. A lie is an assertion known to the speaker to be false. Ananias told a lie, because he knew that he had sold his land for more than he paid into the common fund. A calm reflection on this subject would be of great service in curbing the tongue, and avoiding the improper application of terms indicative of the gravest sins.

Examples of obedience abound in the Scriptures for our encouragement, just as ensamples of disobedience are given for our warning. The characters who, in Old and New Testament history, have walked righteously before God, not having wilfully and deliberately transgressed His laws, will no doubt shine with the brilliancy of planetary stars in the galaxy of the kingdom of the heavens.

It is not possible to lie, steal, commit adultery, fornication, and murder in ignorance, because these things mean the saying of what we know to be untrue, the doing of what we know to be sinful. With the exception of murder, which appears to be an unpardonable crime, it is not for us to fix the precise limits of the mercy of God. Christ's advice to Peter, His treatment of him after the apostle had denied Him three times over, and the general examples we have of the long-suffering of the Almighty, leave considerable latitude to hope for the salvation of truly penitent and reformed offenders. But we shall do well to call to remembrance those words of Paul, "What, shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?"

Among all the stars the Star of Bethlehem shines the brightest. Jesus rises highest in the scale of Divine law. His obedience was perfect. Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Job, Daniel, and John make up a cluster of jewels of rich lustre; but they all pale before The Mountain of Light, the Grand Kohinoor of the Almighty's signet. The Divine cutting and polishing of this Gem added flash after flash; and we wait the day when the Foundation Stone of the Fulness of Light shall be set in Zion, the admiration and glory of heaven and earth.

The obedience of Adam was an image of the obedience of Jesus; his physical constitution was identical; his innocence foreshadowed the spotlessness of his great Anti-type; his fatherhood to the human family resembled the new creation out of "the second man," who is now immortal; his act sealed for ever the lot of all his children, in which there is a parallel with regard to the children of Christ; for being in Christ all will be made alive again, for weal or woe, life or death perpetual is the only alternative of this indissoluble bond.

But where shall we find any likeness between these two Sons of God after the transgression of the first? The fruit once tasted, Adam ceases to be an image of Jesus. We look in vain to find one single ray beaming from his face upon the lowly birth-place of God's only begotten Son. He stands awhile in Eden, then cast out, a dark figure clothed with shame, the fit image of the world's toil and grief. The forgiveness of his crime and the hiding of his shame could not restore his original brightness; he had for ever lost his first estate. Had he remained innocent and free, the path of duty would have led him up to a higher heaven, a state from which there is no fall. He would have become con-substantial with the Tree of Life.

LOVE AND DEATH.

We tremble before the Almighty's wrath; but it is always pleasing to discover, and to dwell upon, the justice and mercy of His ways. Under the present heading we wish to consider the wisdom and beauty of God's plan in bringing the salvation of our race out of the disobedience of Adam.

Adam was the author of death, but "love is stronger than death." The Almighty so loved the creature of His hand that He would not permit death to devour him from the face of the earth. The creature richly deserved this fate, but God does not delight even in the death of a sinner; "God so loved the world that He gave His only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Human penetration can see no other means of saving mankind besides those devised and employed by the Almighty; but the thought of giving such a Son as Jesus to be cruelly slain for the benefit of the rebellious does not lie within the compass of words fully and worthily to express. The anguish and pity both of the Father and the Son belong rather to the language of sighs and tears.

Unless we suppose the Almighty and Jesus to be devoid of feeling, we may faintly picture the effect of this tragedy of love by calling to mind the near ties that bind us to our own offspring, and them to us. The echoes of the groans and sobs, of the last accents of prayer reverberate from Gethsemane through all the chaos and din of war, and stir the heart-strings of many a yearning soul in this far off time.

The Gospel of John is pre-eminently the Gospel of Love. The same is true also of his Epistles; the word abounds everywhere. The grand theme is the love of God to man through Christ, and the proof of it lies in the unspeakable gift.

It is enlightening and consoling to dwell upon this gift. It implies that Jesus was God's peculiar possession: that He held Him in his own right; that there was no just claim whatever upon Him. Here is seen an all-important difference between Jesus and Adam after transgression. When Adam had sinned he was the servant of sin. In the exact language of Scripture, he was sin's bond slave; he was sin's flesh. This legal bondage of his own contracting made his children captives of sin like himself. It was an immense and awful sale. Henceforth all were "sold under sin;" all rights, honours, titles, and estates were forfeited; the world's master and the heir of life, now sunk into the disgrace, poverty, and chains of death. Such, by one simple act, became the legally altered condition of the first man.

Unless this act be clearly understood in its consequence to all mankind, it is to no purpose that we discourse upon the love of God in Christ. No ransom can be appreciated by a captive ignorant and careless of his enthrallment. But where the Scriptures are believed and revered, it is an easy and delightful task to define the way of life.

The utter helplessness of man provoked the deep wisdom and love of God, more particularly we may suppose in regard to the children of Adam. Of these Paul says, they were made "subject to vanity, not willingly;" "death reigned" over them though they "had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."

All the attributes of God are in perfect harmony with each other. There is no unrighteousness in Him; and His righteousness may be understood by man, for the Apostle saith, it hath been declared; and to declare a matter is to make it plain. "But now the righteousness of God is manifested without the law, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God: being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Our business is to shew to our fellows, not only the justification provided by God in Jesus, but also to demonstrate its justice. It is too general a custom to leave questions of religion unsifted, and resort to the easy method of referring them to the mercy of God. But that faith is very defective which lacks a strong sense of the justice of Jehovah's ways. It is a clear knowledge of right which confers a feeling of security. The allegation that we rest our faith on Christ, without a good understanding of the redemption in Christ, is not much more satisfactory, in a spiritual sense, than the belief that the earth rests on the back of a tortoise, without enquiring what the tortoise rests on, is satisfactory in a physical sense.

"All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." This is true in two ways. All sinned in Adam; Paul says, "In whom (that is, Adam) all sinned;" and all have sinned by their own voluntary act.

The first sin caused all mankind to "come short of the glory of God," that is, they fail to reach it. To this terrible rule there is no exception, "in Adam all die." It is not difficult to conceive some individual of this condemned race living according to all the known requirements of God, and it seems sad indeed that such a

one should be cut off, as according to this conception he would be, solely for the offence of another; for a fault which we may assume he would not have committed.

But this difficulty is met by “the redemption in Christ Jesus.” As a matter of fact, not of supposition, we see that first of all death reigned supreme. Against this there is no appeal. What can be more evident than that no act of righteousness can subvert this- universal decree? The good behaviour of a prisoner cannot commute the just sentence passed upon him. It may appear a great pity that so well behaved a person should be shut up in a cell, and sovereign mercy may grant a reprieve, but unless the good conduct subsequent to imprisonment were previously made a condition of shortening the term of punishment, such a measure would contravene justice. We cannot regard the Judge of all the earth in this light. He sees the end from the beginning, and therefore commits no mistake.

Let us now place the proposed Deliverer in the position contemplated; let Him be, for the moment, one of the “all who sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” Now make Him the grand exception to the rule; make Him obedient in all things; is there no difficulty in unerring justice freeing Him from the sentence? Is there no flaw in allowing Him thus to effect His own escape? If we answer No, then it is clear that the law, said to bring death on all, was not fixed and universal. But that there is no disputing; the law is couched in language which no honest reader can doubt; it admits of no exception whatsoever; therefore it would not be possible in justice to permit one born a sinner to be his own deliverer.

To spare the Almighty from all liability to the imputation of partiality and injustice in the matter, we have only to look at what He has done. He has devised and carried out a plan which furnishes absolute proof of His righteousness, as well as of His mercy in the work. His mercy shines all the brighter because we see it in the clear light of justice. It is not the kind of mercy through which human judges sometimes err, under the impression, good enough in itself, that it is better to err, if at all, on the side of mercy. No: the Almighty is most merciful, but he does not err therein.

To be “just and the justifier” God sent forth His OWN SON, and commanded Him to give “His life a ransom for all.” No other man could do this because his life was lost in the first transgression, to say nothing of his own voluntary sins. But we may be asked to prove that the life of God’s Son was free from this, claim. The same fact which proves that Adam was free from death at first, proves that Jesus was free also. Adam was God’s own child. While he remained obedient he was free from sin, therefore free from death. When he disobeyed he became the child of sin, and ceased to be the child of God.

This change of condition is forcibly set forth in the language of the apostle, “Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.” “For when we were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness.” “But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.” The words of the apostle John agree with those of Paul, and place the subject in a very clear light. “But as many as received Him, to them gave He power (or the right, or privilege) to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name.” The language of the epistle is also very pointed, “Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God.” “Beloved, now are we the sons of God.”

Whose sons were these before they became the sons of God? The apostle replies, they were the sons of sin. This sonship to sin began in Eden; and purchase began there also. God purchased Adam, or bought him back from sin at the price of blood. The transaction was figurative of the purchase to be effected by the great and precious price, even the life-blood of the Son of God. The freedom of Adam from sin began with his birth, and remained while his obedience lasted. All this time he was “the figure of Him who was to come.”

But Adam was not then a perfect image of all the conditions under which his great antitype was to become the Son of God; still his estate served sufficiently well for a strong type of his successor. The difference was this; Adam was made son of God from the ground;

Jesus was the begotten son by Holy Spirit from a daughter of Adam. This difference brings us to speak of the reason of the origin of Jesus previously alluded to.

It is important to the correct understanding of the grand scheme of “redemption in Christ Jesus” to apprehend this point without confusion. It has been said that the salvation of man required the Saviour to appear in the nature that transgressed. This is perfectly ‘true; but it does not fully state the necessity of the case. Suppose the Saviour had been formed, as Adam was, from the dust of the ground, the same human, perishable constitution, He would then have been a partaker of the nature that sinned; but though a partaker, or of the identical nature, He would have had no relation to the race. He would have been a person of precisely the same physical constitution, but the first member of another and entirely distinct family. This is very plainly seen by imagining the first and the second Adam to be made, each from the dust, on the same day. They would be both alike, but without any tie of relationship to each other.

In that case there would have been no bond of brotherhood, no sympathy, no power of deliverance. This is why the Redeemer must take on Him, not only the same nature, but be also a blood relation to him who transgressed. This He became by the mother’s side. One of the family of man must be the Redeemer of man. A member of another family or of another nature had no proper connection, and therefore could render no service. The great problem for solution was, How to produce a branch of the same family, flesh of its flesh and bone of its bone, and yet one able to give his life as a ransom? Profoundest problem! Most glorious solution!

Shall we seek for help from a sinner? Shall we place the Deliverer in the death-stricken position of all His brethren? Shall we allow Him to “learn obedience by the things that He suffered,” and then mock Him with the bars of death? May all be spared this awful reflection on the justice of Almighty God.

Most glorious solution! God Himself takes up the case; becomes the Father of another Adam, related to the first by ties of blood. Hence we behold at once the family relationship and the original innocence. If this man can sustain purity of character throughout, then give His life as the price of the lost treasure, the plan of salvation from death is clearly shewn. All depends upon this. His Father has started Him just where He started the “first man;” will He overcome or will He fail? Thanks be to God, and thanks be to Jesus also, He hath overcome. “He hath prevailed.” Never was death so mingled with love and pity, with joy and sorrow, as the death of Jesus. “God loved us while we were yet sinners,” “Christ died for the ungodly,” “The just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God;” the blood of the “undefiled, and separate from sinners,” became the price of ransom, the fountain to wash and cleanse from sin and all uncleanness. With Paul we may say, “We always triumph in Christ,” and that “nothing shall be able to separate us from the love of God;” “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor? Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things; to Whom be glory for ever. Amen.”

THE HEIR OF ALL THINGS.

The doctrine of Divine heirship is a feature in the plan of redemption which well deserves our careful consideration. Paul teaches that in this respect Jesus was superior to the angels. “For unto which of the angels said He at any time. Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee? And again, I will be to Him a Father and He shall be to Me a Son? And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, He saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him.” The preeminence ‘of Jesus from His birth is, by this testimony, placed beyond all doubt. Paul had previously stated that Jesus was “made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.” This “more excellent name” signified that He was to be the Saviour of the world; it signified that the bearer of it was destined to save the world of mankind from death, which implies that without Him men would in time all perish under the law of sin.

By the Father’s side Jesus is heir to the world. He hath given all things into His hand; the uttermost parts of the earth are His. His human relationship to the house of David gives Him a special right and title to the kingdom of Israel. Inheritance among the Jews was not reckoned by the female line. Joseph was of the house of David; and though not the actual father of Jesus, the adopted son born in marriage is heir to the estate of his ancestors.

Jesus was not like Moses, a servant in the house or kingdom; He was a Son over His own house. Adam was at the first in a similar position. He was God’s son; heir to eternal life and the inheritance of the world.

All his descendants were put out of the heirship with him by his fault. His children occupy the degraded position of the children of a nobleman who by treason has lost his estate. Though the heir pursue the most reputable course of conduct, nothing can make reparation, nothing he can do can put the estate in his possession. We have many instances of this in history. The loss of Eden and the introduction of death is a parallel case, and the lot of the descendants of Adam had been hard indeed without the rich provision in Christ. He forms the bright side to the dark cloud. But if we suppose Him to have been in the same condition as they, then the cloud is all dark, not one ray illumines the sad future; the woe is rather augmented by the introduction of a figure so pure and worthy, yet so helpless. And if we imagine the Almighty to be moved to pity at the sight, to restore this Son to the lost estate, we establish an error in Divine justice; in a word, we make the Deity partial, and a breaker of His own laws.

These facts and considerations render it imperative that the Heir to the world, the Heir to the throne of Israel, and the Saviour of men, should be a free born Son; and we cannot conceive any other way by which this could be, than by God becoming His Father through the medium of a woman of the fallen family. No man could have discovered this. It was unsearchable; the unsearchable mystery; the hidden wisdom, in which Paul rejoiced that he had so great a knowledge.

The manner in which Jesus spoke of Himself and His authority while on earth is yet another argument in favour of what appears to be a necessity, viz., that He must be like Adam, free born. He held Himself higher than the Mosaic law. As the disciples passed through the cornfields on the Sabbath day, and plucked the ears of corn, the Pharisees complained. The act of plucking corn was not unlawful for a Jew, but they alleged it to be a breach of the Sabbath law. Then Jesus spake and said, "The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day." If this had reference only to the future Sabbath of His reign on earth, and not to His superiority to the Jewish law, there would have been no force whatever in the saying; but if the allusion made was to the Mosaic Sabbath, then it gives us a very exalted idea of Jesus. The meaning seems to be this - I am now Lord of all; though I do not exercise such authority, I am superior to your law. I am above all things. Could any son of Adam talk after this manner? By no means: that was only proper to the Son of God, "the second Adam; the beginning of the new creation."

The Jews did not understand this. They looked upon Jesus as they looked upon all other men. To them He was Joseph's son; a carpenter, an inhabitant of Nazareth, whence no good had ever emanated, and, in their opinion, never would. They did not recognise His higher rights and privileges; in short, in their eyes Jesus was far inferior to the members of their Sanhedrim. But if we discern these two things, the proper relationship of Jesus to God, to the Adamic family, and the conception the Jews formed of Him, their hostility on the one hand and His exalted demeanour on the other will be more justly understood.

In Peter's address on healing the cripple, he said to the Jews, "But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses." This informs us that Jesus was, in the days of His flesh, just as much the Prince, or Author of Life, as He was the Holy One and the Just. It should be plain to everyone that no person already under sentence of death could be correctly styled the Prince of Life. And when we come to dwell upon the other two titles, "the Holy One and the Just," that is to say, such by preeminence, for in all things Jesus had the pre-eminence, it would be equally unreasonable to apply such titles to one who was constituted a sinner by his birth.

That passage of Isaiah, in chapter ix. 6, has something in it which tends strongly to corroborate the foregoing remarks: "Unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given." Not merely that a child has been born in Israel of kingly race, but that the child born is, in a peculiar manner, "a son given" of God; in other words, the child shall be God's own Son.

The virginity of the mother of Jesus is a matter of great moment. Had the Almighty's Son been the child of a married wife, as it would appear, He might have been, without any just prejudice, an objection might, and probably would, have been raised on all sides. But the well-known respectability and virtue of both Mary and her future husband, Joseph, afford sufficient guarantee for the miraculous-ness of the conception.

Jesus was quite as much entitled to those high marks of distinction in the flesh as in the spirit. Though not in the actual or full exercise of the prerogatives enumerated by the prophet - Wonderful, Counsellor,

Mighty God, Father of the age to come, Prince of peace - He was certainly the elect of them all. And in view of these honours, nay, this equality with God, how can it be imagined that He came into the world a constitutional sinner, "by nature a child of wrath, even as others."

CHAPTER IV.

AARON AND CHRIST.

Jezreel - Beth-el - The Flesh.

There is no character mentioned in the Bible whose presence so fills the eye, whose appearance is so imposing, as that of the first high priest of the tribe of Levi. Considered as high priest, Aaron surpasses Moses in dignity. In the genealogy he is placed before him, for by birth he had the priority. All Aaron's sons were elevated to the priesthood, but the posterity of Moses are reckoned among the Kohathites, who were ministers to the priests.

The exalted position of Aaron is one sign of the still higher position of Christ. In that beautiful and convincing comparison drawn by Paul in Hebrews between Aaron and Christ, we observe that one mark of Christ's superiority consists in His appointment by the oath of God.

"Inasmuch as not without an oath He was made priest: By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." (Chap. vii. 20, 22). "For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by Him that said unto Him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek." (Ver. 21.)

The Almighty's oath is as unchangeable as Himself; and the priesthood of Christ being built upon it, is proof of its immutability; whereas the Aaronic priesthood, not being founded on oath, was indicative of its temporary character. Therefore it is that Paul says, "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament."

This reasoning would enlighten and persuade the Jews concerning the proper place of the Mosaic covenant in the grand economy of redemption. They would be brought to see that a covenant which rested on a changeable priesthood, must of necessity itself be changeable; therefore no everlasting pardon or remission could possibly be obtained by its sacrifices. But Christ was to be "perfected (see margin) for evermore; "in Him, therefore, they would recognise an unchangeable priest, able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him."

The apostle declares that "such an high priest became us." This is equivalent to affirming that the salvation of man could never have been achieved by a sinful priesthood. Paid makes this evident by his next words: "who is holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners." The excellence of Aaron's house was merely that of appointment. The excellence of Christ was intrinsic. Aaron was a sinner by birth and by deed, and therefore could not be a saviour. But Christ was neither. The apostle says, "in Him is no sin." (1 John iii. 5.) He was a human sinless manifestation in order to take away our sins. It is this very thing that constitutes the basis of our hope. If we break in upon this arrangement our hope cannot be "sure and steadfast." Nothing short of absolute righteousness can save sinners.

Be it ever remembered that it is "the word of the oath" that "maketh the Son" what we have just noticed in the words of the apostle. No man "born in sin and shapen in iniquity" could be said to be "undefiled and separate from sinners." It could not be predicated of such an one, "in him is no sin." Christ Jesus was "the body prepared" of the Father on which "He laid the iniquities of us all."

Between all types and the things they typify there is of necessity certain important differences. The general character of a type is relative imperfection or inferiority to its antitype. This is true of Aaron. He was a sinner sanctified, that is to say, a sinful man set apart for the service of Jehovah as the high priest of Israel.

His offerings were, like himself, all relatively inferior; they possessed no real power. The whole performance may be described as a dramatic rehearsal, not of a past but of a future original.

The difference between Aaron's sacrifices and Christ's sacrifice has often been remarked by expositors. "In this passage," observes Macknight, "the Apostle takes notice of three particulars, which distinguish the sacrifice offered by Christ from the sacrifices offered by the Jewish high priests. 1st, He offered no sacrifice for Himself, but only for the people. 2ndly, He did not offer that sacrifice annually, but once for all. 3rdly, The sacrifice which He offered for the people was not of calves and goats, but of Himself."

In allusion to the one offering, Paul writes, "for this He did once." There is a singular unanimity among all the commentators on these words. They say the sense is, "this last he did once, namely he offered up sacrifice for the sins of the people." Both Whitby and Wells refer to the complete agreement of all ancient expositors on this passage.

When Aaron offered sacrifice he had linen garments upon his person from head to foot. The robes on his body prefigured the perfect righteousness in Christ. The place where and the condition in which Aaron offered, were inferior to the place and condition in which Christ offered Himself. The typical high priest presented himself in an imperfect state in a tabernacle made by man; the true High Priest entered in a perfect state into "the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." This Paul speaks of in Heb. ix. 11, as "a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this (the Mosaic) building."

The mediatorial office would not begin outside the sanctuary. Christ, therefore, could not act as our High Priest while He was on earth. "For if He were on earth He should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law; who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for, "See, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." (Heb. viii. 4, 5.)

Aaron entered the holy of holies with blood; Christ entered by His own blood into heaven itself. The conscience of the faithful worshipper is purged, because of the perfection of the offering. Any moral or legal blemish in the sacrifice and the priest would leave the worshipper unpurged. He would be no better than the Israelite under Aaron; a blemished victim and a blemished offerer could never "make him that did the service perfect." In preparing the body of Christ the merciful Father practically illustrated and solved that which to man was, and must have for ever remained, a hidden mystery. The birth, death, and resurrection of Christ, are a tangible and truly a glorious "revelation of the mystery" which had been hid for ages and generations." In other ages," wrote Paul to the Ephesians, this mystery "was not made known to the sons of men." But the record God has given of His Son unfolds it all by patient and devout study; and the free and equal invitation to the Gentiles also explains "the fellowship of the mystery;" showing how the Gentiles should be made fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel." He who understands these things and loves them will feel the fitness of the apostle's words when he styles them "the unsearchable riches of Christ."

The Mosaic high priest and his work were "the mystery of the Christ" in symbol; and during the whole period of the existence of the symbol the solution of it was, we are told, a subject of anxious desire on the part of prophets, righteous men, and angels. The Eternal Spirit in the prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ; but neither men nor angels were able to say what those sufferings signified.

The birth of the Son of God was the signal for praise and joy among the angel hosts of other orbs. Gabriel, who had been commissioned by Jehovah to visit His "handmaid" in the city of Nazareth, had probably carried to them the glad tidings. It was he, perhaps, who visited the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem to announce to them, amidst a terrific display of light, the advent of the promised seed. While watching their flocks in the awful stillness of the night, alert for the least sound indicative of the approach of lion or of wolf, "Lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them, and they were sore afraid."

The plain was wrapped in electric fire, and the white glistening figure of an angel stood in the midst and cried, "Fear not, for behold I, bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger."

When he had pronounced these words, “ suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.” And then the light faded; the echoes died away among the distant hills; the startled flocks sought fresh repose on the dewy grass; the angels had gone away into heaven; the group of shepherds forgot their flocks, and stood a moment wondering in the starlight at what had occurred: their decision was soon taken; it was resolved to go at once into Bethlehem “and see this thing which,” said they, “the Lord hath made known unto us.”

JEZREEL.

The geographical and doctrinal aspects of this Hebrew name are full of interest. The city from which the famous valley of Jezreel takes its name belonged to the half tribe of Manasseh, and was situated on the west of Jordan, between latitude 32° and longitude 35° degrees. The valley is of vast extent, and though uncultivated, it is still very fertile. It is judged to be highly suitable for the production of wheat. Thistles are said to abound in parts of it, and to reach a growth of eight feet high. Where once fine palaces of the kings of Israel rose, and rich vineyards nourished, there the Arab finds pasture for his sheep and goats, and roams unfettered as the winds.

In Jacob’s prophetic blessing the vale of Jezreel was assigned to the tribe of Issachar as part of their possession. The old seer likened his son to “a strong ass, couching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute.”

Two hundred years later the great captain, Joshua, stood with Jacob’s sons upon “ the land of promise,” drawing lots for its division among the tribes. And he tells us himself that “ the fourth lot came out to Issachar, for the children of Issachar according to their families.” This was a grand lottery of rich prizes; and the issue of the drawing was controlled by Him who directs all things after the counsel of His own will. “Their border,” which “was towards Jezreel,” enclosed “sixteen cities with their villages,” and “the outgoings of it were at Jordan.”

No doubt Jezreel, which signifies the seed of God, stood with feverish anxiety waiting the issue of the lots. Nevertheless the whole seed were sure that whatever difference there might be as to the desirableness of their respective estates, a valuable portion somewhere in the land would fall to every one.

Four hundred years after the holy seed had taken root in the soil of Canaan, the first king fought his last battle in this part of the country, and, with Jonathan, his son fell ignominiously, on the mountains of Gilboa. The enemy cut off his head, and nailed his body to the wall of Bethshan. This sad event touched David’s heart, and was the occasion of the first out-burst of his poetic fire. His generosity would not allow the least allusion to the ill-treatment he had received from Saul; he remembered him only as the Lord’s anointed and Israel’s valiant king. His shame at the thought of these evil tidings reaching Gath and Askelon; his passionate apostrophe to the mountains of Gilboa; his invocation to the daughters of Israel to weep over Saul; and his overwhelming distress at the memory of Jonathan’s fidelity and love, make up an ode, whose strains melt the soul, and will be admired through all time.

Jezreel, or the seed of God, is a kind of *imperium in imperio*. The entire seed was made holy by divine appointment, and separated from “the seed of men” in the universal sense. But among this chosen seed there has been in all its history but a very small proportion that has borne good fruit. The Jezebel section of the community has generally been in power, and even the prophets of Jehovah have been compelled to hide themselves for a season. Those who delighted to walk after the flesh have always found some pious and plausible reason for seizing the humble vineyard of Naboth, conspiring to accuse him of treason and blasphemy, and to stone him to death.

Paul seems to have had the figure of a kingdom within a kingdom in his mind when he declared that “he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God.” And again, when he dictated this passage, “Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: Neither, because they are the seed of

Abraham are they all children; but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.”

The prophets of Israel and their children sometimes represent the Great Prophet and His children, who are styled “the sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty.” One plain instance of this is found in Hebrews, where Paul quotes the first part of the eighteenth verse of the eighth of Isaiah, in application to Jesus and His Brethren.

“Behold I and the children which God hath given me.” The object of the apostle, we judge, is to show that, like as the prophet’s children partook of their father’s nature, so Messiah was a partaker of the nature of His brethren; that is, of “the seed of Abraham.”

But the rest of the prophet’s words Paul did not find occasion to cite. They bear upon a subject he did not then wish to speak upon, but which serve to illustrate what is said in the beginning of the preceding paragraph. Those words are as follow: “for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth in Mount Zion.” And if the reader will place together the meaning of the names of Isaiah’s children, he will perceive that they reveal the future purpose of Jehovah to be accomplished by the holy seed with Christ at their head. Isaiah’s children were for signs and wonders to be fulfilled in Israel when Christ shall come forth for Israel’s deliverance with ten thousand of His saints.

A like doctrine is couched in the names of the children of the prophet Hosea; one of which names has been selected as the heading of the present chapter.

It will be observed that this prophet appears to hold a relation to his wife similar to that which Jehovah often chooses to employ Himself in relation to Israel. That is to say, the prophet is put in the place of God, and Gomer, the prophet’s wife, stands for the whole nation of God’s chosen seed.

When we consider the character of Gomer, her fitness as a figure of Israel at large is seen to be perfect. The Almighty pictures Himself in the prophets as having married Israel; as having loved and betrothed her to Himself when she was an outcast, a slave, and despised. No figure could more forcibly and beautifully portray the exceeding love of God, and the exalted position of the chosen seed.

Israel’s crime was black in the highest degree. She was unfaithful to her Husband and her Lord; she openly went after other lovers; she departed from the Husband of her youth, and courted the favours of the Assyrians, the Babylonians, and the Egyptians. This national infidelity and spiritual unchastity is described at great length by the prophets, particularly by Ezekiel in the twenty-third chapter.

Hosea was commanded to take unto himself a wife, who should literally represent to the nation the crime of which they were guilty. The first child was the prophet’s own son, and under the command of God was named Jezreel, which, as before stated, imports “seed of God.” It may be inferred that the other two children were illegitimate, and symbolize the cast-off and the restored Jewish nation. Herein also the great condescension and forgiveness of the Almighty is strikingly taught, inasmuch as He permits His unfaithful wife to return to His lost favour on condition of repentance. Nay, He is even described as pitifully alluring her to return and dwell with him in faithfulness and peace.

Jezreel, the prophet’s own son, stood as the “seed of God” before his nation, and was the representative of that portion of it who obeyed the commands of Jehovah. It is somewhat significant that a personage styled the “seed of God” should be appointed to mark out the highest attainment of obedience to God. In short, this fact at once brings to mind the burden of Scripture that God had declared He would have a Seed or Son, in whom He should be well pleased. And it is hereby suggested that while this Seed of God should be manifested in the nature of his brethren, he would be far above them all in his relationship, being God’s own and only child.

Such seems to be the typical value of Jezreel. No expression could so forcibly show the descent and high standing of the Messiah as the phrase “Seed of God.” No language would better imply Messiah’s absolute freedom from sin. The nature in which this promised Seed appeared did not contaminate it; it was pre-eminently “the Holy Seed.” All the other was only holy by appointment or adoption; this was holy from

birth. The other was “the seed of the serpent,” because Adam sold it all to the serpent; or in Paul’s words, it was “sold under sin.” Messiah was not “the serpent’s seed,” but the “Seed of God.” The seed of the serpent has no power to fulfil the prediction against itself; it cannot bruise its own head. Its function was to inflict an inferior wound on the “Seed of God,” while the latter was to destroy it altogether. To distinguish the “Seed of God” from “the seed of men,” or “the serpent’s seed,” it is also styled “the seed of the woman.” This is the great Seed which the Eternal promised to Abraham; and which He also promised to raise up unto David, of which Seed He said “I will be to him for a Father, and he shall be to Me for a Son,” *

As a consequence of a future betrothal “in faithfulness,” the prophet predicts a large outflow of temporal blessings. “And it shall come to pass in that day, I will hear, saith the LORD, I will hear the heavens, and they shall hear the earth; and the earth shall hear the corn, and the wine, and the oil, and they shall hear Jezreel.” This figure indicates a hearing, or concurrence, or subordination, or servitude throughout all things, directed by the hand of God for the advantage and comfort of His seed.

In the wording of the next verse there is an evident allusion to the meaning of the title Jezreel. “And I will sow her unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God.”

All these great and good things circle round the one Seed, which is Christ. The rest of the seed have become the seed of God through the Anointed. They were constitutionally the seed of the serpent. In this respect the Jews were no better than the Gentiles. Paul declared that he had proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they were all under sin. They were all under sin because all had become the property of sin. Viewing them in this enslaved condition, Paul applied the Scripture which saith, “There is none righteous, no, not one.”

The Seed in chief purchased the rest with His own blood. He gave His life a ransom. None of them could by any means at their command redeem his brother. The rich could not buy, neither could the poor beg the wondrous boon. They could not be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold. The great and precious price was not to be found in earthly riches. It must emanate from God, therefore God sent His only begotten Son. None of the good and righteous men of old had any power. They all needed help themselves, being “without strength.” The arm of the Lord was seen, mighty to save in Jesus Christ, The Righteous. He is the Root and Branch on which all the seed is borne in the spiritual sense; and being of royal Israelitish offspring also, He has the natural claims to sovereign power. Every setting sun marks the approach of this Great Sower, who will fill the earth with the “seed of God;” this will be the great day of Jezreel.

* *This rendering is more correct than the C.V. The passage is quoted in Heb. I. 5, from 2 Sam. vii. 14.*

BETH-EL.

The city which bore this name, the meaning of which is The House of God, has a kind of double history, presenting a general resemblance to the history of that other House of God composed of living stones.

The town stood a little to the north of Jerusalem, and between it and Ai—another spot of great interest—lay Mount Ephraim. It was to this mountain that Abram came and builded an altar to the Lord, after he left Haran, traversing Sichem and the plain of Moreh. On his return journey from the south he stayed here a short time and made an arrangement with his nephew, Lot, as to what portion of the country each should dwell in.

In this matter Abram showed a true generosity, giving his younger relative the first choice. By this time, Abram had become very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold. He is a rare example of a rich and righteous man. His quickly acquired wealth does not appear to have cooled his religious ardour. It is recorded that on this second visit “he there called on the name of the Lord.”

Here Jacob saw the vision of the ladder connecting earth with heaven. Messengers were ascending and descending in the execution of their offices as watchers over the affairs of men, for the final good of the House of God. The erection of the pillar, and the anointing of it with oil, might, to the troubled mind of the patriarch, have a mystic significance, foreshadowing the Chief Corner Stone, the Anointed One. Under

temporal trial it is that the heart seeks shelter and repose in a strongly guarded future. The human bark cuts her moorings and flies for some pacific isle, resting on the bosom of an ever glassy sea.

When the prophet Samuel judged Israel, he included Beth-el in his yearly circuit. The last day that the prophet Elijah sojourned on earth he called at Beth-el, and there prayed Elisha not to follow him farther. It was there also that the children were torn by bears for mocking Elisha on his return from beyond Jordan, after his master had been carried off in the chariot of fire. In that memorable revolt which rent the house of God, it was at Beth-el that the usurper placed one of the golden calves, appointed a feast, ordained priests, and built an altar to hinder the people from again repairing to Jerusalem. Before this altar stood a man of God, out of Judah, and uttered an awful prediction, which was confirmed by the altar being rent and the arm of Jeroboam being dried up while in the act of putting it forth against the prophet. These denunciations were literally fulfilled three hundred and fifty years afterwards by Josiah, who tore open the graves of the idolatrous priests, took out their bones, and burned them on the altar. "And he slew all the priests of the high places that were there upon the altars, and burned men's bones upon them." The two very ancient prophets, Hosea and Amos, foretold the destruction of Beth-el and its idolatrous worship.

When Paul and Peter speak of the obedient believers of the gospel, they sometimes employ the figure of the house of God, borrowed no doubt from the literal house in Jerusalem. In his epistle to the Hebrews, Paul refers to Moses and his house, to show in a more striking manner the exaltedness of Christ. Moses was a servant, but Christ was a Son; Moses ruled in the house of another; Christ in His own house; Moses builded his house according to a given pattern; Christ was the creator of His own house. The difference is very great.

The Son of God was the true Lord and owner of the house which He builded. Jesus was quite as faithful, nay, more faithful than Moses; but His conduct towards God was that of a son to his father. Moses gave his commandments, not in his own name, but in the name of the Lord. Jesus spoke as one that had supreme authority; issued precepts in His own name, and plainly declared Himself to be the Lord and Master of His disciples.

In consequence of this, Christ was counted worthy of more glory than Moses. His sovereign dignity is strongly sustained by Paul in the first and second of Hebrews. He is not only superior to men, but to angels. In rank every angel stands far below Him. Yea, they are commanded to do Him homage. He was superior to angels in dignity, and higher than all men in purity; separate was He and undefiled.

He is the foundation of His own house, and "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid." Neither Jew nor Greek can enter into the composition of this building, and remain unclean; those who touch it are cleansed and sanctified thereby. The truth makes clean, and Jesus is the truth. All the children of Christ have been given to Him by His Father. They are gifts to the altar, so to speak. The altar is greater than the gift; and every gift is sanctified by the altar to which it is brought.

As the spotless victims under the law were for the reconciliation of the house, so Christ hath, by His own blood, made full reconciliation for His own house. This He accomplished for the constituents of the house while they were sinners; enemies of God; by which God commended His love towards them. There is, therefore, the gravest assurance that they will be saved by His life. This was God's work, God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself; and the apostles, as Christ's ambassadors, prayed man and besought them, saying:

Be ye reconciled to God, for He hath made Him, that is, Christ, who was without sin, a sin-offering for us, that we' might be made the righteousness of God in Him.

God, according to His gracious promise, opened a fountain to the house of David, for sin and for all uncleanness. The fountain was soon made accessible to Greek as well as Jew. It is open still, and will be till the end of the Messianic age, when this world will be purged from sin. Like the Syrian of old, we are implored by the humble messengers of Jehovah to wash and be clean.

Faith in these things, which works by love, purifies the heart. This is the great object of all: "be ye holy, for as I am holy." It is a most salutary reflection that, like as God dwelt in Christ, He desires also to dwell in us. Think of the goodness, the purity, the love, the long-suffering of God. Are we so governing and

purifying ourselves as to become a fit dwelling-place for this marvellous perfection and power? Or, are we daily defiling and polluting His temple, cleansed and reconciled by the blood of His spotless and only Son? Are malice and envy still tenants of the house? Do wrath and clamour yet echo within its walls? Do these barbarous sounds still shock the strangers' ear, where all should be holy calm, or rapturous music from the heavenly lyre?

THE FLESH.

The frequent occurrence of this phrase, and its connection in several of the most striking passages of Paul's letters, make it well worthy of our consideration.

As the epistles were addressed to Jews as well as Gentiles, there are portions which speak sometimes to the one, sometimes to the other, and sometimes to both. To profit by the reading, it is therefore necessary to take due notice of these distinctions. It will be immediately perceived from the context of the words taken from the third verse of the third chapter of Philippians, that Paul made allusion to the law of Moses: the expression "the flesh" is therefore at times equivalent to "the law." It is still more comprehensive, for it includes circumcision; and thus it may be said to cover the whole legal existence of the Jew from Abram to Christ. To make this plain we will transcribe the passage:

"For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh: Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more."

"Any other man" is to be taken in a limited sense. The rest of the passage shows that Paul meant any other Jew at Philippi; not any other man, Jew or Gentile, in the whole world.

"Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee."

Here the apostle specifies the advantages he could, if he thought proper, boast of in "the flesh," that is, as a Jew of high standing; a member of a noble tribe - for Benjamin was classed with Judah - a pure Hebrew by father and mother, not as many who were born of Grecian women—and of the noblest sect among the Jews. And more still, the apostle declared himself to be, "touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless." In this last particular Paul was like Zacharias and his wife Elizabeth. "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless."

"The flesh," then, appears to be an elliptical, or shortened form of words, signifying the law of Moses and circumcision. The same law is elsewhere styled a carnal ordinance, that is, an ordinance pertaining to the flesh, briefly named "the flesh." This abridged and laconic style is not uncommon in the Sacred Oracles, and is very convenient to the writer; though to foreign readers, or to readers of a much later age, it is not without difficulty, and demands the exercise of the thinking and enquiring faculties in order to a good understanding of the subject matter of discourse.

In other parts of Paul's epistle he uses the expression "the flesh," in quite a different sense, which shows the need there is for determining the import of the same words by the connection in which they stand.

"They that are in the flesh cannot please God." From a misapprehension of this text some have concluded that to please God it is necessary to die - to put off the flesh in a literal sense; that flesh is essentially a wicked thing. However this may be, the text in question does not teach such a doctrine. Just before Paul explains what he means by "they that are in the flesh." "The carnal mind," he says, "is enmity against God." And in the verse but one preceding he indicates clearly what he intends by "the carnal mind." They that are of carnal mind "do mind the things of the flesh;" that is to say, they gratify their animal passions in every way at their command. In this there is such a wide field, and some vices seem so near akin to virtues, that it is incumbent to be always watchful.

The curious extremes of the human mind have often made excessive devotion and excessive carnality meet in the same individual; hence it has not seldom been remarked that one man was composed of several

different characters. Piety and inconsistency, spiritual and carnal extravagance, often walk together, and the brighter the light the darker the shade.

These defects did not escape the observant eye of Paul. His counsel in the matter was, "Let your moderation be known unto all men." "Every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now, they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible." Such as do not give heed to this wise counsel are said to be "in the flesh;" while to them who follow it Paul would say, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit."

Consider in how many ways this may be true; how it may apply to all, the rich and poor; but particularly to the rich, who have means, and consequently the temptation, to keep "in the flesh," and therefore for whom it is no easy thing to "walk in the Spirit." A rich man living with moderation and frugality that he may have the more wherewith to do good unto all men, but especially to the household of faith, is a truly noble and admirable sight.

But in view of the frailty of human nature, and the temptation of riches, the Christian is almost constrained to desire only those things that are sufficient for his daily wants. It is easier to be content with little than with much. Contentment is a chief element of spiritual life, "godliness with contentment is great gain."

"The carnal mind," which more literally translated would read "the thought of the flesh," Paul says, "is death." That is, it leads to death. But this saying must not be strained, or it will charge the apostle with affirming what he did not intend. The foregoing remarks have probably shown that one of the senses in which Paul employed the words "the flesh" indicates animal or worldly-mindedness. It is this which he declares is death. An extreme view of the passage would make the apostle teach that flesh cannot conceive a single idea but what is displeasing to God. This interpretation will not stand.

God, who created the brain, has rendered it capable of evolving thought, both good and evil. There is no change in the material of this organ or engine of thought, because the owner of it avows himself a convert to the Christian faith. It is qualified for a variety of work, and according to circumstances, one part may be very active, while another is almost dormant. This is produced by what phrenologists call "cultivating" and "restraining," the best lessons for which are found in the Scriptures. The Book of Proverbs and the New Testament Epistles abound with advice to suit every variety of humanity; but if you will have it all in one brief sentence, take the comprehensive admonition of Christ: Do unto others as you would they should do unto you.

"For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." Rom. vii. 18. If Paul here referred to his material body and its members, there would seem no need to throw in the clause "that is, in my flesh," after the word "me." The "me" can point to no one but himself, whether in his Christian character, or in an assumed position. "That is, in my flesh," looks much like a comment on the word "me," as though he were using it just there in a particular way. The seventh and eighth chapters well support this sense. In the first the apostle takes the part of a carnal-minded Jew, who has a certain knowledge of the law, but finds himself in a wretched condition because he cannot fulfil the desires of the flesh, and keep the commandments of God at the same time.

Then in the eighth chapter Paul describes a man who is "delivered,"—a man to whom there is no more condemnation, because he is "not in the flesh" or following the fleshly passions, but in Christ, walking after the commandments of the Spirit. The phrase "my flesh," in this place, therefore, appears to be a shortened form, similar to the phrase, "the flesh," before spoken of.

* *"Hardly anyone, I think, reading the whole passage continuously, without any regard to the arbitrary break at the close of the seventh chapter, would be in danger of supposing that the Apostle Paul, though speaking in the first person, is describing his own character, in his regenerate sanctified state, when he describes a man "sold under sin;" "brought into subjection to the law of sin;" "doing the evil that he would not"; "not doing the good that he would; " and living a life of wretched contradiction to his own judgment."*

* See Whateley's Extract, *Christadelphian Lamp*, November, 1873, p.19.

CHAPTER V.

IN THE SPIRIT.

The Natural Man - He that is Spiritual.

The import of this phrase, like the import of the phrase "the flesh," cannot be known by any single rule. It is a form of words peculiar to the sacred writers, and employed by them in a variety of senses. The highest meaning of spirit is God; the lowest perhaps is flesh, described as "a wind," or spirit, "that passeth away, and cometh not again."

The Eternal Spirit is imaged to finite minds by those things which, so to speak, are the shadows of Himself; eternal power and wisdom written in letters of fire on the blue arch of heaven, seen and heard in the vastness and roar of the ocean; in the meting out of the earth with His span; in measuring the waters in the hollow of His hand; in weighing the mountains in scales; in reining the winds in His fists; expressed in the present and future of His offspring ordained to rule over all.

On these shadows the human eye can gaze; the human mind meditate; but the Substance hath no man seen, nor can see. He covereth Himself with light as with a garment.

Light obscures light; but the effulgence of Jehovah's covering is sometimes scarce supportable by man. The seraphic brightness had blinded the returning sinners to Eden's gate; Moses could but behold "the after glory;" the heart of Israel melted at the base of flashing Sinai; the plains of Dothan were filled with chariots of fire; the captives of Chebar and of the Aegean isle beheld a man whose aspect was as the sun in meridian splendour; the fire-cloud made the night luminous to the escaping slaves; the shekinah glowed within the second veil; the dark grave of Jesus shone with lustre from the face of angels, and the transfiguration struck its witnesses to the earth. Such are some of the appearances and the effects of the likeness of the glory of the Lord.

There is a sense in which all men, and perhaps all things, are in the Spirit; "for in Him we live, and move, and have our being." He is therefore not far from every one of us. But there are numerous particular and widely differing relationships.

Bad men, as well as good, have served to unfold the future through the prophetic glass. "From the top of the rocks" Balaam saw the future as well as the present fortunes of the Hebrew nation. "From the hills I behold him; lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." The great King of Babylon thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God "had wrought toward him." How great are His signs! and how mighty are His wonders! His Kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and His dominion from generation to generation."

Some of the old seers were in the Spirit in their waking hours; others while in deep sleep; all, except Moses and Jesus, heard the Divine will, and foresaw His purpose in mysterious words and strange imagery; but they talked with Jehovah in plain familiar speech, as a man talketh with his friend, a father with his son.

Spirit envelops the universe; and, controlled by God, sustains it all. But wide indeed is the range. Of things created, the beginning is at those without life; the foundations of the earth: the end or summit the highest mind developed through imperishable substance. Thus, in all things we behold the Creator, out of whose Spirit all things came. The sea is His; He made it, and His hands formed the dry land. He hanged the earth upon nothing; He bound the waters in the clouds; He hollowed out the depths of the seas; He sprinkled the canopy of night with golden stars, a silent escort to the silver moon. The lilies of the vale offer their sweet and cloudless incense before His throne; the liquid voices of the birds hymn forth His praise. He feeds the ravens when they cry; and the beasts of the forest wait on His hand; the hairs of our heads He numbers; and not a sparrow falls to the ground without His notice. All His works speak His goodness and declare His glory. A feeling of peace and safety beyond expression dwells in the hearts of those who intelligently and obediently put their trust in Him; such are in the Spirit.

Next to immortality, the superhuman powers of the apostles is the highest phase of spiritual existence. This is in reserve for the saints, together with that life now hid in Christ, and not to be bestowed until His appearing, when the same power will undoubtedly exceed that which was primitively exhibited in earthen vessels. Jesus on earth enjoyed a larger share than His apostles, but even that was limited when compared to His present might, "all power" being given to Him "in heaven and in earth."

The grand aim of the believer of the Gospel of the kingdom of God is to live in the Spirit now, that he may attain to an abiding place in it at the coming of Him who said, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." If we fail in this, all our conceptions, reveries, and reasonings, however accurate and sublime, are no better than intellectual garniture - an elegantly furnished dwelling without an inhabitant, or one whose tenant lies in the embrace of death.

Man is constituted so as to be capable of doing good and honouring his Maker, just as he is capable of everything which is contrary to justice, reason, and propriety. In scripture style these two sides are named the flesh and the spirit, and the best directions are given for the repression of the one and the growth of the other.

When a man has obeyed the gospel, he is no longer in the flesh. A transfer according to Divine law has been made; and it is proper, in speaking of such, to say, "ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit." As a matter of law and right, they are therefore required to display the fruits of the new state into which they have been graciously brought, and to destroy all thorns, briars, and roots of bitterness. The flesh is like a troubled sea, a clouded angry sky, a howling, withering blast. The spirit, an ocean, calm, clear, and deep; an azure sun-lit heaven.

When under the hand of Omnipotence man sprang from the dust of the ground, he was physically in the flesh, but morally in the spirit. Transgression subjected him morally to the flesh. He gratified the flesh and received the wages of sin. Such by nature, therefore, is the estate of all his children; he sold himself and them. His moral guilt was punished by a physical penalty, which was dischargeable by none save the morally guiltless. Morality rests in law unbroken, and no one on whom the broken law takes hold can effect his own release.

The gospel shews how men in the flesh can be transformed to men in the spirit. This legal change effects nothing as to flesh, that comes in the twinkling of an eye after approval at the judgment-seat of Christ. While in the flesh they are said to be in darkness; in the spirit they are in marvellous light. They are in darkness because under the shadow of death; in light, because in God, who is light, and in whom is no darkness at all. But this great deliverance leaves their flesh just as it was, because it is only a moral deliverance, to-end in a literal one; even as the captivity of Adam to sin was at first moral and afterwards literal, depriving him of life.

The great salvation by Christ is seen in the fact that though literally of the flesh, He was always morally "in the Spirit." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Not being born of the will of the flesh, the Christ was never in subjection to the flesh; He was born in the spirit, and walked therein to the end - even to Gethsemane, and after resurrection became spirit, namely, "the Lord the Spirit."

Spiritually speaking, a man is not "in the flesh" because he is made of flesh, any more than he is spirit, or immortal, because he is "in the Spirit." Flesh is not an insuperable barrier to a walk in the spirit; but he who "walks in the flesh" is at enmity with Christ, who, though of the flesh, was never "in the flesh." A correct knowledge of the different scripture uses of these terms, flesh and spirit, is a considerable help to a good understanding of the New Testament epistles.

THE NATURAL MAN.

The Proverbs of Solomon, the Epistles of Paul, and the Discourses of Jesus, depict "the natural man" in every conceivable position and circumstance, presenting a code of moral philosophy attempted by thousands, but equalled by none. The myriad vanities, weaknesses, and follies of mankind, are all sketched and finished with an unerring pencil. From the still, evil thinker; the low whisperer; the loud and constant backbiter; the vain glorious boaster; the self-righteous person; the envious self-consumer; the gross and refined sensualist

to the godless moralist; the learned, polished, and abstruse disputer; the devout fanatic; the devouring and pious hypocrite; - every mask is torn off, and every line and trait displayed in impartial light.

Man is perhaps more apt to deceive himself than he is to deceive others, and not more in anything than in religious feeling. He bemoans the corruption of his fellows, and corrupts his own mind by the poison of an overweening conceit. The whole world lies in wickedness; there is no justice in the earth; human nature is an evil thing; thus he muses himself into a separate being, and forgets his identity with the common stock. He deplores all carnality except his own; affects a peculiar isolation; sees undefinable danger in the beauties of the natural world; declaims against all knowledge he does not possess, and pretends to pity, if not despise, those who have it. This mood begets irrational eagerness for universal change, breeds hasty predictions, and brings the crack of doom on every wind.

Such inordinate and morbid piety not unfrequently results from a misunderstanding of certain terms or sayings in the Word of God; the very reverence for His Word, in this case, produces much mischief.

“The natural man” is an expression employed by Paul to signify a state of mind in contrast to another state of mind represented by the phrase “the spiritual man.” It is similar in meaning to the words “in the flesh.” The connection in which the apostle uses it serves to illustrate what is to be understood thereby. It will be seen, when we come to consider his illustrations, that, in this sense of the words, “the natural man” is not to be looked for among believers of the gospel, such as are continually desirous to know more of the mind of Christ. He is an entirely different character: one who either refuses altogether to admit scriptural evidence into his reasonings; or, who, on the other hand, while professing to believe such evidence, is never satisfied when it is presented in reply to his demands.

The two are introduced by the following statement - “For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom.” It is after an elaborate comment upon these, particularly the Greeks, that Paul declares that “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”

The members of the body to whom these words were addressed had, for the most part, been brought over from paganism of the grossest and, at the same time, the most polished kind: for none exceeded the Greeks in profligacy, and none excelled them in poetry, philosophy, oratory, and art. It is their subtle philosophy, their eloquent and refined speech that Paul styles “wisdom” - “the Greeks seek after wisdom.”

When Paul went amongst them, preaching “Jesus the Christ and Him crucified,” he said in his first Epistle to them afterwards: “And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech, or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God.”

“The Greeks,” wrote Seeker, “did not object to the gospel, that the authority of it wanted the proof of signs from heaven, but that the preaching of it wanted the recommendation of what they called “wisdom.” Neither the manner of the apostle’s teaching was adorned with that plausible oratory, of which they were so fond; which soothed the ears, and entertained the imagination; which could make a bad cause victorious, and a good one suspected; - nor yet was the matter of his discourse made up of curious speculations; abstruse points in philosophy debated with acuteness; theories built upon slender foundations to great heights, then attacked with subtle objections, and defended with more subtle refinements. These were the delight of the learned Greeks, and agreeable to this was the treatment which they gave the gospel of Christ. Its doctrines had nothing amusing to minds full of trifling curiosity; its precepts had many things disgusting to human sensuality and pride; its proofs were inconsistent with their prevailing notions. So it was rejected without examination, by persons whom the irony of Job suits perfectly well, “No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you.”

This reception of Paul’s gospel by the Greeks accounts for several expressions which occur in those parts of his letter to the Corinthians, in which he describes “the natural man.” The great men of those schools were offended and filled with scorn: first, because they could not deny the power of Paul; and secondly, because so marvellous a doctrine was preached to them without the aid of that elegant style, that refined mysticism and endless conjecture, which gratified their taste. The truth of God concerning a sacrificial, a risen, and an immortal Redeemer, came to them in a very humble, plain, and simple dress. This manner of

preaching the cross of Christ they called “foolishness.” Therefore, Paul makes use of the phrases, “the foolishness of preaching”, “the foolishness of God,” and so forth, in reply. He repeats their own words in the argument by which he proves that this “foolishness,” as they delighted to call it, was wiser than their “wisdom;” this weakness was “stronger” than their strength.

“The natural man” among the Jews was such as hypocritically professed to seek evidence of the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah;

asked of Him “a sign,” “a sign from heaven;” while in reality they would have been offended at any such grand display of power in His favour, as they demanded. They hated Him because His lowly birth and humble life did not answer to their cherished expectations, and also because of the actual wonders which God did by Him. Their bitterness and hypocrisy reached the greatest height after He had raised Lazarus from the grave; for this act they would gladly have killed Him, and Lazarus also.

Their doings fully justified the withering language which, from time to time, Jesus was incensed to utter; but He knew their thoughts before they brought them forth. The mild, patient, and courteous manner which He adopted to those among them who manifested a desire to understand His doctrine, whether they were His own disciples or not, is a further proof of what we have said, namely, that the “natural man,” in the sense of the words now under consideration, is not to be looked for among that class really anxious to know the will of God. Let this be remembered in our dealings with opponents, both within and without, and it will give somewhat of that charm and graciousness to our conversation and discourse which made His hearers hang upon His lips.

“The natural man,” regarded as an animal existence, has been abundantly proved to be incapable of that middle state imagined by the pagans, fostered in their post-mortem hero-worship, and continued on such an enormous scale by the “Roman Catholic Apostolic Church,” more truthfully described in the word of inspiration as the “MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” The whole arcanum of image worship, feasts, fasts, prayers, telling of beads, &c., &c., has this vain imagination, and this only, for its support; and as regards “Protestant England,” the doctrine has been said by one of the great lights of her Church to be the lie proclaimed from a thousand high places of our land.

It deprives the gospel of its glad tidings; it makes a mockery of the resurrection of the dead; it blots out the inheritance of the saints; it asserts the dead to be living; it stains eternity with the existence of the wicked; it invents a subterranean torrid zone, and a misty, sleepy dreamland for the “departed;” it incurs an immense expenditure to deceased friends in shrines, prayers, and masses: it deceives more than half the civilized world; and is the strongest of all delusions.

All this pious flattery and costly deception is extinguished into rayless night; is hushed into impenetrable silence: is replaced by the bright unfading hope of endless life, where the Scriptures are allowed to “speak freely.”

What is man? and to what shall he be likened? The Eternal Spirit answers: Man is dust, he is like the grass of the field, like a flower cut down, a faded leaf, a passing wind- a dried-up brook, a drop in a bucket, a floating vapour, a span, a potsherd, a thread cut off, a puff of breath, the beasts that perish, a quenched flame, nothing, and less than nothing.

HE THAT IS SPIRITUAL.

Having briefly considered “the natural man.” We will now take a glance at the spiritual. In many respects he will be found to be the direct opposite; and though not at present the opposite of the natural man in his physical nature, even that will eventually be transformed.

The apostle declares that the spiritual man possesses the great advantage of “judging all things, while he himself is judged of none.” The “all things,” however, judged, or discerned, as the margin puts it, by him, can only relate to such as the apostle speaks of; those, in fact, which “the natural man” is unable to discern. Paul did not teach that because a man is spiritual he is competent to judge in matters of art, science, and letters, but in those things which God has revealed to us in the Scriptures for doctrine and practice.

Neither must it be imagined that there are no: degrees in this spiritual judgment or discernment. The shades of difference are as certainly distinct in this matter now, as that there will be gradations of rank in the resurrection state, which differences the apostle illustrates by a beautiful comparison among the stars - "For one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead." The difference of power to form a correct judgment in spiritual things arises from the same causes which enable one to form a judgment superior to another in natural things; namely, higher mental endowments and larger acquirements. No miracle is connected with the work; it is the result of application and honesty of purpose.

There is no branch of knowledge about which men are so vain and assuming as spiritual knowledge, and none in which it is so difficult to give satisfactory proof of what is affirmed. Some pride themselves upon mysterious aid specially sent from God, and persuade themselves that nearly all they know and believe is revealed to them in this way, and that they can at any time command a further revelation by prayer. But the measures taken by the Almighty for the illumination of mankind in regard to His purposes, the command to "search the Scriptures," and the formation of man's mind for enquiry and reasoning seem to us a much more reasonable view of the subject. But it must not be supposed that we would speak lightly of prayer.

It would seem that a state of mind is represented in scripture style, by the figure of a man. We have "the old man" and "the new man," and we are commanded to "put off" the one and to "put on" the other, which expressions at once change the figure of a man into that of a garment.

The same thing is also set forth under the figure of a double man - "the outward man" and "the inward man." It is presented, too, as a conception. Paul speaks of Christ being "formed" in us.

From these things we obtain the idea that "the spiritual man" is the result of a process, and not of a sudden act or momentary change. He is the subject of growth, not of immediate creation; and his advancement and success depend upon the careful continuance of his culture, just as the vine must be tended and guarded to become fruitful and profitable to man.

The formation of Christ in us is a figurative expression, the meaning of which is obvious enough; but the attainment of the object in all its fulness is exceedingly difficult. It progresses to a comprehensive knowledge of all that pertains to Christ, as taught in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. It includes all the things concerning Himself, as He Himself testified, when going through those writings, to His disciples after He was raised from the dead. This is the first, or intellectual part.

The next is the full formation of the moral character upon His as the model; each man, as far as his own capacity allows, being assimilated to that perfect image. This is a work of great magnitude and merit. It is frequently referred to in the Proverbs of Solomon, and esteemed superior to all other things. Its influence is also great upon others; it moves those who are within observing distance in a subtle and powerful manner; it is a silent monitor and judge, effecting more than lies in the power of words; and, in the end, makes a man's enemies to be at peace with him.

We ought to be encouraged in our continuance in well doing, by the reflection that the righteous Judge will not measure each merely by the quantity of fruit he produces, but by the circumstances, favourable or unfavourable, under which the fruit has been borne. It would be unreasonable to expect the same quantity and quality of fruit from each of two trees when one was much inferior to the other, or if one was well managed and the other lacked the necessary attention. Thus it is with Christians in different stations of life. A man whose days must needs be spent in a mine, or at a forge, ought not to disturb himself by aspiring to what in his case is impossible. The Judge will not estimate his fruit by the same standard which He will apply to the man of large opportunities. The basis of decision will be upon the proportion of advantages possessed, and the way those advantages have been employed. So that it may turn out in the end that many, to whom little was given, will supersede those who enjoyed much, because they put their little to the better use.

In the fifth chapter of the Galatians Paul enumerates two sets of things; the one natural or animal, the other spiritual. He represents the bringing forth of these, which he names "the fruits of the Spirit," as a process not altogether easy, and attended with pain of mind. Before the spiritual can appear, the tendency to natural growth, that is, to the fulfilment of the animal desires, must be checked and subdued. The figure

which the apostle employs, in speaking of this, shews at once that is an arduous task: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." That is to say, they have learned to control their passions and propensities: they have left off the practice of those things which he calls "the works of the flesh," and then speaks of in detail.

From the first verse of the sixth chapter of Galatians we gather a clear idea of what it is to be spiritual: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." In the twenty-fifth verse of the preceding chapter, Paul speaks of living in the spirit: "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit."

The word spirit is derived from a word which means to breathe. The disciple of Christ professes to be breathing, as it were, not the spirit of the world, but that spirit which condemned the world in the utterances and actions of his Lord. If this is truly the case, he will be found "walking in the Spirit." He will be seen daily exemplifying in his own person, those pure and exalted principles which made Jesus, while on earth, the greatest and best of men. Where those who know what the gospel is, do not walk thus, there the truth is held in unrighteousness; better not to hold it at all. They are threading their way down to an eternal grave, with the lamp of life in their right hand. If we are not walking in the spirit, we are certainly doing what Paul terms "sowing to the flesh." There is no middle or neutral course. We may be sowing to the flesh without an understanding of the gospel, or we may be guilty of the same dereliction of duty with our minds informed. In the first case, we are no better than the beasts that perish; in the second, we are certain to receive a dreadful punishment at the resurrection of the dead, and afterwards to be consigned to what is called in Scripture "the second death," which is "everlasting destruction." "for to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace."

We revert for a moment to prayer as a characteristic of spiritual life. "If any of you lack wisdom," the apostle James says, "let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not: and it shall be given him." Spiritual knowledge is not to be had merely for the asking. To ask signifies much more than to ask God in prayer. The attainment of this kind of wisdom is made by Solomon a matter of diligent perseverance. "My son, if thou wilt receive my words, and hide my commandments with thee; so that thou incline thine ear unto wisdom, and apply thine heart to understanding: yea, if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures: then shall thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God."

This process of industrious search for Divine truth is termed asking, and it is rational to believe that those who give themselves to it in faith will be favoured by God with a fair measure of the needful opportunities and means or acquiring it; but to expect the blessing without those endeavours, would be as unreasonable as to expect wages without work.

CHAPTER VI.

A PRECIOUS PROMISE.

A Rich Inheritance - A Gracious Offer.

As Jesus stood in the temple, asserting and proving His divine authority, He said to the Jews assembled concerning His Father's word: "Ye have not His word abiding in you; for whom He hath sent, Him ye believe not." Jno. v. 38. No reason could be more cogent, for the works which He did were overwhelming proof that He was sent of God; "for no man," remarked Nicodemus, "can do these miracles that Thou doest, except God be with him."

After this direct charge of having let slip the word, the Lord continued, "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me. And ye will not come to Me that ye might have life." Verses 39, 40.

It would appear from this that the Jews did believe that in their Scriptures, that is, what we call the Old Testament, there was to them a promise of eternal life; and in this belief they were perfectly scriptural. David had said, "As for me, I will behold Thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness." Daniel had declared that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." And the Saviour refuted the doctrine of the Sadducees, who, while denying a future life, professed to believe Moses' writings, by shewing that Moses at the burning bush was taught the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Luke xx. 37.

Some sects among the Jews in Christ's day had no faith in the doctrine of a life after the present; of these, as just mentioned, were the Sadducees, who denied resurrection, the existence of angels, and spirits: but the Pharisees, the leading sect, "confessed both." Many of them too had borrowed from the Greeks the notion of intermediate existence, which they managed to hold together with the teaching of the Scriptures that eternal life was promised therein. We often find no difficulty in fostering and publishing contradictory doctrines.

Jesus requests them to pause; He acknowledges their admission of life in the Scriptures; but points out that they were looking in the wrong direction to obtain it. It would seem that they either expected life to be given to them, apart from any particular person at an appointed time, or that they thought they had it inhering in their mortal bodies. At all events they were disposed to expect it from any quarter rather than from Him who was speaking to them. This was the ground of Jesus' complaint: "ye will not come to Me, that ye might have life." If the Jews did not see clearly that eternal life was to come to them through Messiah, that ignorance would as effectually hinder them, as would the rejection of Jesus as the Messiah.

Jesus desired them to learn that the precious promise, yea, all the promises were in Him and that out of Him they could receive nothing. The promise was not to seeds as of many. but as of one. He it was who should first receive life and then be the dispenser of it to all who should come unto Him. "Come unto Me. all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" - verily that eternal rest" which yet "remaineth for the people of God."

Modern Christianity on this point is as visionary and worthless as the faith of the old pagan philosophers. Men may feel offended to hear it, but in reality what better is it than the belief in the transmigration of souls? According to that doctrine the soul would ultimately re-inhabit its body, but instead of sending it meantime to heaven, for which there is no scripture warrant, the Pagan occupied the interval by pretending that the departed spirit would passed from beast to beast, from bird to bird, or from fish to fish. We may smile pitifully at this notion; but hundreds of scholars have demonstrated that it would be quite as defensible from the Word of God as the idea of the spirit ascending to heaven. Protestants ridicule and abhor the popish dogma of purgatory for souls; but if the matter be brought calmly to the proof by the Word of God, it will be found no easier to establish the proposition that the soul goes to heaven at death, than that it goes into purgatory. To the fancy the former is pleasing, and the latter painful; but both alike are not to be found in the Bible: from the standpoint of scripture truth, therefore, they are equally unworthy of credit.

The only life man now enjoys is animal life. which is enjoyed in common by all the animal kingdom. In this respect alone "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; as the one dieth so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath, all go unto one place, all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Such is the plain unflattering language of the Holy Oracles.

But to man God has been pleased to give a great and precious promise. "And this is the PROMISE that He hath promised us, even ETERNAL LIFE." The gospel is the "high calling," and "the prize" of it is "in Christ Jesus." The prize is not already in the possession of all men by nature; it is at the end of the race - "the race for life." Christ has run the race and received the prize. He now holds it in His own right, ready to bestow it upon all who "run so as to obtain." He will not give it until the race is run by all who are to enter the lists, so that those who win "may be glorified together." This is the custom among men. After the contest is finished the successful competitors are called together, and the judge distributes the prizes according to merit. "They do it for a corruptible crown, but we for an incorruptible." The day of award is a time of great

rejoicing for the victors, and of disappointment and ignominy for the vanquished. So Christ has declared that He “will come again,” and “then will He reward every man according to his works;” the victorious will “sing aloud,” yea, “shout for joy,” while the rejected, clothed with shame and distracted with anguish, will cry out for the rocks and hills to fall upon them and hide them for ever from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne.

A man whose head is correctly informed concerning this precious promise, and whose “heart is right in the sight of God,” whose words and actions agree with the doctrine and morals of the New Testament, will burn with gratitude and love to God for sending His Son to gain this prize, and also to the Son for offering to give it unto him. Such a man will feel beforehand somewhat of that seraphic fire that touched the prophet’s lips; his ecstatic ear will be filled with the triple cry, “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory.”

A RICH INHERITANCE.

While the Bible clearly proclaims to man an offer of immortality, it is equally explicit in its promise of a rich inheritance. Those who scorn the idea of this world becoming the domain of the resurrected and immortalised believers in Christ, as though it were at once a material and grovelling desire, ought to reflect whether it is not sanctified by the word of Him who created the earth, and formed it to be inhabited. They ought first to consider how far the word of its Creator and Upholder justifies them in despising one of the great works of His hand, and whether they have the authority of Scripture for indulging their hopes for the possession of any other world.

When God made man from the dust He did not raise his thoughts higher than the sphere on which He placed him. He did not inculcate the idea that man’s residence was too mean and worthless for his permanent abode, that it was merely a scene of probation, a vale of tears, a dismal thorny path leading up to a sunny, flowery clime. On the contrary, what we know of the earth by experience, together with the account given, in the book of the Creation, of that portion of it where our first parents were located - the garden, the rivers, the gold lying hid beneath - all commend it to its new inhabitants as a rich and desirable abiding place.

Besides, the Creator has not described to man the other orbs that move in boundless space; except to call them the sun, moon, and stars. They are only spoken of as subservient to our world for heat and light, by day and night. Whether they are inhabited or not He has not told us; neither has He informed us of their structure, size, distance, or composition. All that is known of them in these respects has been gathered from the scientific labours of men, reaching from the present, backwards to the remote ages, when the rudiments of astronomy were budding on the plains of the Eastern World.

Nearly every Bible allusion to the land of promise is such as to inspire all, who have not seen it, with a strong desire to behold it for themselves. It takes precedence of all others; it is a land of hills and valleys; the most luscious fruits of the earth and the gayest flowers are there; honey drops from its rocks, wine and milk abound o’er its vales, and cedars of a thousand years crown its heights. But, leaving that region, are we at any loss for wealth and beauty in the earth besides? The natural parks of Australia, the broad plains and rivers of Africa, the grandeurs of the far West of the New World, the indescribable charms of Europe, the sublime scenes of Asia, and the laughing isles of ocean - are not these enough to fill man’s highest, noblest aspirations?

The earliest promises to the founders of the Israelitish nation imply the permanent inheritance of the earth by man, and specify the unchanging possession of that part of it on which this ancient kingdom stood.

Jacob gathered his sons around his dying bed and told them what should befall them in the last days, and it is manifest from several points in the prophecy, either that the prediction is false, or that the nation who sprang from that patriarch still awaits its complete fulfilment. The sceptre has long departed from Judah, but there has been no gathering of the people under Shiloh’s rule. The position assigned to Zebulon does not accord with the history of the past. Joseph’s bow does not now abide in strength, and both he and his anti-type are still separate from their brethren.

The reiterations of the promises in Deuteronomy, or the second law, confirm their first announcement; nor is it reasonably possible, though Moses died and was buried, to exclude him from a share in the

inheritance. The circumstances under which he died are purely those of hope. Though his foot was not allowed to cross the Jordan, his eye beheld the beauties of his future home when the prophet like unto himself should be king in Jeshurun. For 4,000 years the curtain of death has hid the glorious spectacle from his view.

The sweet odes of David dwell chiefly on the inheritance to come. He deplored beforehand the trampling of his crown in the dust, but rejoiced also in the prospect of its after and final settlement on the head of his Son and Lord. In his inimitable songs he likens this transcendent Son to all the resuscitating powers of nature; the sun, moon, and stars image forth His life-imparting and illuminating strength, while the nourishing dew and gentle rain pre-figure His fertilising force of mind. His purifying and gladdening of the world's sin and sorrow-stricken heart.

The poetry of Isaiah soars to its loftiest heights, on the theme of the second Eden; he beholds the veil of night lifting before the rising sun; a rich feast of fat things and wines on the lees, well refined, spread before all nations; the wilderness is scented with the rose; the pine, the myrtle, and the box screen the parched face of the desert; while all the animal creation are united in a covenant of peace to one another and to their ruler - man. The tears of Jeremiah are dried away, as his vision peers through the many scenes which have wrung rivers of blood from the heart of his nation, to that time of great deliverance, purity, and political power. He forgets the sword of the enemy, the ruined and blackened cities, the withered grass, the exhausted brook, the silence of the beasts, and the departure of the birds, when he contemplates the living tide of Israel rolling back again upon its native shores; hears the busy hum of rising cities; the eager voice of new purchasers; witnesses the buying of fields and the subscription of evidences; the re-establishment of religious rights and ceremonies; the reinstatement of the priests; and the mild benign government of the second David.

Ezekiel stands at the mouth of the valley of death. Myriads of bones lie bleaching in the clear hot sun; when, lo, a spirit passes through the vale; the bones move; flesh creeps o'er their length and breadth; a fine skin falls upon these new forms; then they rise and stand erect, emerge from the silent valley, and fill the wondering eye of the world. The prophet turns and spies them as a peaceful flock of sheep resting on their ancient plains, safe under the great Shepherd of the sheep. Their fraternal discord, once stronger than the bars of a castle, is lost in the magic blending of two sticks in the prophet's hand.

Daniel, in vision, sees the beginning of the golden age. He beholds the great idols of earthly power shattered by the unexpected fall of the mysterious stone; the stone grows into a political mountain and fills the whole earth, which he then observes is subject to the saints and the Ancient of days.

Zephaniah perceives all the peoples of the world serving the Lord with one consent; and Malachi, the last of the watchmen, discerns from his tower a smoke of pure incense ascending steadily up to heaven from the rising to the setting of the sun.

A GRACIOUS OFFER.

Of these things, namely, life everlasting and the inheritance of the world, the Almighty has made to man a gracious offer. It is a serious fault, and indicates no right acquaintance with the Bible, to allege, as some do, that realistic ideas of man's future are not sustained in the writings of the New Testament, but arise from a too material view of the promises of the Old. Whether we take the concise and simple narratives of the Evangelists, the practical accounts of the Acts of the Apostles, the dense and sometimes intricate arguments of the Epistles, or the peculiar symbolism of the Apocalypse, there is sufficient plainness of speech to justify the people of God in their hopes of real and solid gifts in the kingdom of the heavens.

If it be proper for Christians to cherish an ethereal prospect, the Jews were certainly false interpreters of those promises under whose influence they departed from Egypt and entered the Holy Land. The rule by which they read the words of Moses is the only rule applicable to the terms of God's gracious offer through Jesus; if the spiritualising of this be justifiable, it could as easily be maintained that the Jews, under the guidance of Moses and Joshua, worked out for themselves a historical result contrary to the intention of Jehovah.

The last message from heaven invites all who thirst to drink of the water of life freely. A blessing is pronounced on them that do God's commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may

enter through the gates into the city. This city, then a city set upon a hill which cannot be hid; the Holy City, consisting of the holy people, is declared to be the light of the surrounding nations; and the kings of the earth bring their glory and honour into it.

God's tabernacle is with men. The redeemed of all nations, kindreds, and tongues, exult in the bliss of immortality, their victory over the Harlot City, and their reign over the nations of the earth. The Lamb who ascended, has now descended. He stands on His own Mount Zion, attended by the heavenly hosts, encircled by His blood-washed myriads, whose voice is as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder. The music bursts in heavy peals, rolls now loud, now soft, among distant hills, swells like a river through the vales, and, mingled with its echoes, rises up to heaven and dies away upon the trembling air.

God, in His great mercy, offers this world to man, with endless life to enjoy it. The anxious inquiry of the Lord's immediate disciples and the answer He gave them are convincing proof. Solicitous to know what they, who had forsaken all, should receive, Jesus replied without a parable: "Ye who have followed Me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for My name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life."

During the last forty days of Christ's sojourn amongst men, after He had tasted and triumphed over the bitterness of death. He discoursed upon the things concerning the kingdom next to be established; and while the cloud hid their ascending Lord from view, the testimony of angels fell on the disciples, assuring them of His return to fulfil His Father's promise. And all their lives this glorious hope burned brightly, fed and attested by the wondrous powers which everywhere confirmed their word.

Peter spent the earlier part of his apostleship in presenting this gracious offer to his own nation, but while lodging at the house of Simon the tanner, by the sea-side at Joppa, he was directed to carry the same invitation to the Gentiles. The beloved physician, Luke, in his last treatise, narrates the story of the visit to the centurion's house in simple and interesting style. For the encouragement of the strangers, Peter avouched that God was no respecter of persons: he reminded them of the good news that had been preached in Jesus' name throughout all Judea; of the fact that he himself was one of those who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead; that it is He who was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead; and that to Him give all the prophets witness. When Peter had fully explained the matter, and his new friends had believed it, the whole work was confirmed by the immediate gift of tongues, followed by individual obedience in the waters of baptism uniting them to Him who had commanded the apostle to go and make to them the gracious offer.

Luke also tells us how Paul travelled through the lesser Asia, Greece, Italy, a large portion of the Mediterranean seaboard, and several of the islands, bearing the glad message of the gift of life and of the world in His name who smote him to the ground while journeying to Damascus. Whether we follow him into the synagogue, to the forum, to the sea-side, or to his own hired house, the great work on which he was engaged, instant both in season and out of season, was the exposition of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, urging collaterally the indispensable obligation of a holy life to make disciples meet for the proffered inheritance. After this extensive tour, when he sent letters to the churches he had formed, the most powerful incentive to reformation of life and to growth in scripture knowledge, was the mercy of God and the love of Christ; the one in giving Him, the other in shedding His own blood to confirm the covenant of the promised possession. He endeavoured to rouse the disciples at Rome to increased diligence, by reminding them of the confirmation of the covenant in the blood of Jesus, and that their acceptance of God's gracious offer, through Christ, had constituted them joint heirs with Him of life and inheritance. For this he himself had suffered the loss of all things; though a Roman citizen was even bound with a chain like a common slave; yet counted he nothing dear to himself if he might only win the prize.

As he stood before Agrippa he was careful to show that the charge against him had relation to the promise made of God to the Hebrew fathers. In addressing the Galatians, he sought to restore them from their foolishness and bewitchment by arguing that nothing, not even the law of Moses, could disannul the original declaration of God establishing the covenant in the hand of the Seed. But it is not needful to allude to the particular instances in the epistles; they all, more or less, speak with precision and clearness, showing

that life everlasting and this world are in store for the obedient believers of the gospel. "Therefore, let no man glory in men: for all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours." 1 Cor. iii. 21. 22.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ASCRIPTION OF SIN TO CHRIST.

The Holy Spirit in Relation to Sinful Flesh - The Seed of the Serpent - The Woman's Seed.

Any portion of sacred writing which has the appearance of discord with any other portion, ought to be carefully examined; and, to aid investigation, the serious thought of God's word being in contradiction to itself should not for one moment be entertained.

In every translation of the Bible there are many errors, and in those called original copies of the Hebrew we have no guarantee for complete accuracy. But the first object should be to harmonize, by sound reason and fair criticism, the text as it stands; for if a too ready inclination to solve difficulties on the ground of textual error be admitted, the mind will gradually relieve itself of the burden of close examination of all passages pertaining to the difficulty, and take an easy way to its explanation by making the supposed necessary alteration of the words.

The earnest labours of God-fearing biblical scholars are continually making plain and accordant many passages, which once presented what looked like insuperable obstacles; and it is only men who are wanting in faith and patience, that on account of present inability to understand some things, cast aside, as unworthy of reliance, the whole volume.

The title under which our present chapter is opened refers to certain seeming contradictions in doctrine, and these are of a most important and solemn character, inasmuch as they belong to Him who is the foundation of our faith, the staff of all our hopes. Let us not imagine, however, that this foundation is or can be defective, - that this staff may turn out to be a broken reed; but let us see whether our ideas of their solidity and strength are in unison with the facts in the case.

In that memorable exposition of things concerning Himself which is found in Luke xxiv. 27, 44, the Lord Jesus declared that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Psalms. It is in the Psalms that we find numerous passages which attribute sin to Christ; and the question is, how are these statements to be received, so as not to disagree with others more numerous and equally plain, which teach the perfect innocence of Jesus, affirming that in Him was no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth.

The answer, that Christ committed no sin, only partly meets the difficulty; for if in His bodily composition He were the subject and partaker of sin, then sin was in Him, and by no fair honest reading of the word could it be asserted He was undefiled.

The eleventh verse of the twenty-fifth Psalm reads thus: "For thy name's sake, O Lord, pardon mine iniquity; for it is great." - Psalm xxxi. 10. "For my life is spent with grief, and my years with sighing: my strength faileth because of mine iniquity, and my bones are consumed." Psalm xxxviii. 4. "For mine iniquities are gone over mine head; as an heavy burden they are too heavy for me." Verse 18. For "I will declare mine iniquity." Psalm xl. 12. "For innumerable evils have compassed me about: mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head: therefore my heart faileth me. 2 Psalm li. 2. "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity." Verse 9. "Blot out all mine iniquities."

These statements are held by some persons to refer to Christ. There can be no doubt that certain portions of the Psalms, from which they are extracted, do point to Him, for the apostles quote them with that intent; but whether the words above given are to be so understood is not positively stated. We perceive,

however, no objection to this application if it be rightly apprehended; but when made with the avowed intention of proving sin to be in the Messiah, we are bound to demur.

Let us first give a correct definition of the term iniquity, in order that we may know what is signified by the use of that term in allusion to Christ. "INIQUITY - Latin, *iniquitus* - absence of, or deviation from, equal or just dealing; want of rectitude; gross injustice; unrighteousness; wickedness." - Webster. Now, what is to be said to these things as regards Christ? If there were iniquity in Him in the days of His flesh, then it consisted either in the absence of, or deviation from, equal or just dealing; or else in the commission of gross injustice, unrighteousness, or wickedness; that is to say, He was guilty either of a sin of omission or of commission. Iniquity is not a physical property; it is a wilful neglect of duty, or an actual transgression of law. We ask, who will dare to aver these things of the Lord Jesus Christ? But, if those passages from the Psalms are applied to Christ, in order to prove Him under sin, and sin to be in Him, the result is either that an absurdity is asserted, as in the contention for iniquity as a physical property, or else sin is laid to His charge.

Take another verse, Psalm xxxviii, 5, My wounds stink and are corrupt, because of my foolishness. Parts of this Psalm are thought to refer to Messiah, and some include the words of this fifth verse. But who would accuse Jesus of foolishness? And who would be ridiculous enough to pretend that foolishness is a physical property; something in human flesh, or any kind of flesh? Yet, the views we are combating and exposing have no other choice, indeed no other is sought.

It is maintained by some scholars that several of these passages from the Psalms are found in an improper connection; that they do not accord with the subject and sentiments of the immediate context; and that they properly belong to other Psalms. Upon our own knowledge, however, we are not able either to affirm or to deny this.

Having assented to the proposition that the passages named may allude to Christ, that iniquity, sin, and foolishness are in some sense predicable of Him, it will be asked, what explanation have we to offer? We answer, there are two explanations which appear to us satisfactory; the first arises out of the peculiarity of the Hebrew language; the second from the doctrine concerning sacrifices.

"Dans le stile des Hebreux, *ma rebellion* signifie quelque fois *la rebellion qui s'excite contre moi.*" (Saurin.) That is, "In the Hebrew style, *my rebellion* sometimes means *the rebellion which is raised against me.*" Again, says the same writer, "In the Hebrew style they say my wrong, instead of saying *the wrong done to me.*" This information throws much light upon the passages in question; yet it is not, in our opinion, more satisfactory than the second explanation.

When the high priest of the Jews made expiation for sin, he laid his hand on the head of the victim, thereby transferring, as it was understood, the sins of the people from them to it. As soon as this was done the animal was looked upon as the sin, or the sin-bearer. In the Hebrew it is called the sin, *the bullock the sin*. So also of Christ, the great sacrifice. The sinless victim, for the time being, is regarded as the sin, because the sins have been laid upon Him. *He bare our sins*; God hath *laid on Him* the iniquities of *us all*. The sins and iniquities having been transferred to Him, they became His, not ours, and by His death they are taken away. He died *for* us, He gave His life a ransom *for* all. But the transfer of sins to Christ did not constitute Him really a sinner; had it been so, He could not have risen again; His death would have been as final as the death of the unredeemed. He voluntarily suffered the chastisement of our peace, and endured stripes *due to the children of Adam*.

Sins are transferred to Christ by imputation; in this way they were transferred to the animal victims. To bear sin in His body, means to bear the punishment due for sin, that is, death. To make His redemption effectual it was needful to bestow on Him power to buy, and to subject Him to Trial similar to that under which Adam failed. There are the plainest proofs that this was done; first, by His being God's Son; second, by His committing no offence against God's laws.

Some of the Psalms cited could not justly be applied to David, for, with few exceptions, he was a man after God's own heart. Indeed, no theory but that of imputed sin can give to them a satisfactory explanation, but that theory removes all difficulty.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN RELATION TO SINFUL FLESH.

The phrase, "sinful flesh," is not placed at the head of this article because it is either scriptural or rational: it is neither. It is now used to represent a grave and foolish error; and, in connection with the other phrase which precedes it namely, the Holy Spirit, we shall endeavour to shew what this error is, or rather that what we are about to speak of is an error.

But, before proceeding to the subject itself, a remark or two upon sinful flesh will be needful. Some of our readers may challenge the statement that *sinful flesh* is not a Bible expression, and direct our attention to Paul's words in Romans viii. 8. We do not deny that the form of words is there in the English translation, but we affirm that those words are not a proper rendering of the Greek in that text. *Sinful* is an *adjective* assigning a certain quality or property to the flesh; but in the Greek there is no adjective. The original word is a noun in the genitive case, and the two words are *sin's flesh*, not *sinful flesh*.

A little consideration will shew the reader, who has not studied the matter, how important this difference is; he will perceive that, instead of flesh being sinful in quality, it is, according to the apostle's actual words, a property or possession belonging to sin; therefore it is not sinful flesh, but sin's flesh. This mistranslation being rectified, the reader may take his Concordance, which will reveal to him a remarkable fact, namely, that the words sinful flesh, do not occur once throughout the Scriptures.

Among Christians in general there is a belief, more or less serious, that, in the matter of religion, man can do nothing without the aid of the Holy Spirit, popularly styled the Holy Ghost. By this Agent, his mind must be stirred; he must receive faith and understanding; must be endowed with wisdom from on high, and strengthened with a resolution to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. And the necessity for this assistance from the Holy Spirit lies, it is taught, in the defiled state of man's nature; he is a fallen creature and can do nothing for himself, but is entirely dependent on the promptings of the Holy Ghost.

In confirmation of this, and as a specimen of recognised authority, we transcribe Dr. Clarke's comment on John iii. 5;

"To the baptism of water a man was admitted when he became a proselyte to the Jewish religion; and, in this baptism, he promised in the most solemn manner to renounce idolatry, to take the God of Israel for his God, and to have his life conformed to the precepts of the divine law. But the water that was used on the occasion was only an emblem of the Holy Spirit. The soul was considered as in a state of defilement, because of past sin; now, as by the water the body was washed, cleansed, and refreshed, so, by the influences of the Holy Spirit, the soul was to be purified from its defilement, and strengthened to walk in the way of truth and holiness.

"When John came baptizing with water, he gave the Jews the plainest intimations that this would not suffice; and that it was only typical of that baptism of the Holy Ghost, under the similitude of fire, which they all must receive from Jesus Christ, see Matt. iii. 11. Therefore, our Lord asserts that a man must be born of water and the Spirit, i.e., of the Holy Ghost, which, represented under the similitude of water, cleanses, refreshes, and purifies the soul. Reader, hast thou never had any other baptism than that of water? If thou hast not had any other, take Jesus Christ's word for it, thou canst not, in thy present state, enter into the kingdom of God. I would not say to thee, merely read what it is to be born of spirit; but pray, O pray to God incessantly till He give thee to feel what is implied in it! Remember, it is Jesus only who baptizes with the Holy Ghost, see John i. 83. He who receives not this baptism has neither right nor title to the kingdom of God; nor can he, with any propriety, be termed a Christian, because that which essentially distinguished the Christian dispensation from that of the Jews was, that its Author baptized all His followers with the Holy Ghost.

"Though baptism by water into the Christian faith was necessary to every Jew and Gentile that entered into the kingdom of the Messiah, it is not necessary that by water and the Spirit (in this place) we should understand two different things; it is probably only an elliptical form of speech for the Holy Spirit, under similitude of water, as in Matt. iii. 11, the Holy Ghost and fire, do not mean two things, but one, viz., the Holy Ghost, under the similitude of fire, pervading every part, refining and purifying the whole."

In making inquiry into the papal custom of saint-worship, that worship is found to rest entirely on the belief of the immortality of the soul, for it is not the bodies of the saints that are prayed to, but their souls.

But when it is proved that the soul is mortal, not immortal, what becomes of all this worship, and intercession for the souls of dead saints? It is worse than useless.

We should be very sorry to be thought to deny that there is any Holy Spirit, but we have good reasons for not giving credence to its operations on the minds of men to enable them to believe and live in the Christian faith. Furthermore, when it is shown that human nature is not that defiled thing which some affirm it to be, what need is there of these promptings and co-workings of the Holy Ghost to render it capable of believing and obeying the gospel? Here is a grave and prevalent error, arising out of the unproved and unprovable proposition that man is made of sinful flesh.

If this were true we should be inclined to allow the reasonableness of the great personal work allotted to the Holy Ghost. Such a power would then be needful. But admitting it, we should still be involved in perplexity as regards the written Word, which is explicitly said to be sufficient to make one wise unto salvation; sufficient to thoroughly furnish unto every good work.

A matter which is based altogether on individual feeling, as is the gift of the Holy Ghost, must be very deficient and questionable as evidence of the possession of Divine truth; for we observe persons of widely varying beliefs all claiming the same heavenly gift; logically, therefore, the justification of one would be the condemnation of another.

But when we turn to the apostles and their friends, on whom the gift was bestowed, we are not confronted with any such obstacles. They were all able and willing to demonstrate that they possessed supernatural power. We do not read that they make so much of feeling they had received the gift, as that they employed it for their mutual edification, and as undeniable proof that they were preaching and teaching a doctrine not learned from man, but from God. It would seem that the pretended bestowal of the Holy Ghost is rather an impediment than an aid to the reception of the gospel by men of a reflective cast of mind; inasmuch as it is said to be enjoyed where reason can shew that the principles of the Bible are neither understood nor followed.

The Quaker doctrine of "the light within" is part of this subject; but we do not intend to go into a detailed consideration of that phase of the question. It appears that this "light" is, on the whole, nothing more than what men call "conscience," a capital guide in general matters of good and evil, but inadequate to the inculcation of the glorious gospel of the blessed God; also, of very little use in the acquisition of science or of art.

The apostle teaches that it is in the exercise of our senses that we learn to discern between good and evil. "The senses," scientifically so called, are the only avenues by which facts and arguments can enter into a man; but it is alleged that these are so defiled and depraved that no good can result from their action, unless moved and controlled by the Holy Ghost.

We have, however, never heard it contended that the Holy Ghost was essential to inform and guide man in finding out the laws by which the Almighty governs the universe - gravitation, attraction, repulsion, and motion. And what has confessedly been done without this agency cannot be matched by anything that has been done with it, if we exclude the miracles and powers of Christ and the apostles. In these we admit its presence and operation, but the general claim to it we deny as destitute of evidence; and we also deny the existence of that which is made the sole ground of its essentiality, that is, the sinfulness of human nature.

The power of the Holy Spirit being indispensable from such a cause amounts to the charge of sin, in a cruel shape, against God, and the exercise of a force which in justice had been superfluous; for if God had not created human nature just what it is, according to this argument there would have been no necessity for the intervention of the Holy Ghost. We anticipate the plea that man denied his nature; but there is no evidence whatever to sustain this theory; it is only imaginary; and a calm investigation of the Divine record concerning man prior to transgression will quickly explode it as utterly untenable. Is it not beyond confutation that the same mental movements, the same moral proclivities which carried the first man over the divinely-drawn boundary line, are precisely the same movements and proclivities which from then until now have been the spring of all wilful sin? We firmly believe that, on the whole, man is as capable of doing his Creator's bidding to-day as at any epoch of his existence, when he comes to know what God requires.

The legal disabilities under which man groans are universal; sin hath reigned unto death; and by one man sin entered. But the physical disadvantages are not of universal application. Millions live, flourish, and die, with all the organic soundness and pleasure of life which can be derived from a corruptible nature, and it should not be forgotten that corruptibility was as true of man before sin as after it. Mortality is the specific effect of the law of a corruptible organisation; but decay and dissolution are the necessary results, at some time, however remote, of all corruptible things.

As to whether the gospel can be understood, believed, and obeyed, without this mysterious mover, is easy of decision. It was obeyed of old, long before its disciples, in one recorded instance, had any idea of the intended effusion of the Spirit, (see Acts xix. 2). From the account of the conversion of Cornelius and his household, we gather that the Spirit fell on them after the exposition of the Word, but before their obedience in baptism.

It is written that faith comes by hearing; it is the mental realization of things hoped for; the conviction of things not seen. This mental realization comes from a clear knowledge of things promised; the conviction is the consequence of their settled belief. The things promised are described nowhere except in the Word of God; the necessary realization and conviction must, therefore, arise from the perusal of the Word, the only requisites for which are the desire, ability, and time to do so.

There is another kind of faith: but that is really a miraculous gift; we mean faith which can remove mountains. This is not the faith of the gospel which is set before us for obedience unto eternal life. It appears to us that the notion of the Holy Ghost assisting sinful flesh is but an example of how one error springs from another, and that it is, therefore, most important that we should thoroughly examine the first premises of our belief.

THE SEED OF THE SERPENT.

Reference is here made to the animal in Eden which is said to have conversed with Eve; and which, as elsewhere stated, we deem symbolic; the phrase, "the seed of the serpent," is undoubtedly to be taken in a figurative sense. The serpent stands for the father of all the disobedient, or rather for all who are involved in the disobedience of the first man. Those who are "born again," being adopted into the family of God through Christ, are not henceforth the serpent's seed, but the seed of Him by whom they are thus begotten to newness of life: in a word, they are the seed of God.

On this question no asseveration has been made which, to our mind, is more repugnant than that "Jesus Christ was the seed of the serpent." Adam became the seed of the serpent when, at the instigation of his wife, he tasted the forbidden fruit. He was then the offspring of the principle inculcated to Eve by her own "lust," or unlawful desire, and imaged by that beast which was pronounced more subtle than all the beasts of the field which the Lord God had made. But this legal degradation did not poison Adam's blood; it did not necessitate that all his children should be physically or morally debased. Abel and Cain were brothers, yet how dissimilar their characters. Murderers do not inevitably beget murderers, nor thieves, thieves; but it is probable that the child of an habitual thief will become a thief through example.

The consequences of allowing the first transgression to corrupt the moral and physical nature of man, and still to hold him amenable to all the decrees of God, present the Deity as unreasonable and cruel. If the moral nature became depraved, lowered from its original standard, man is deprived of the powers needful, on his part, for reinstatement in favour with God. It were enough for this primal breach of the peace between heaven and earth, that it should be followed by such penalties as could be removed at any time, by the application of redeeming power. But when we consider the nature of that power, it was evidently not designed to operate a return to the physical condition supposed to have been lost, but to remove, first, all legal disabilities contracted; and, second, to produce, not the imaginary original nature, but an entirely new and superior being. What Adam was to the serpent's doctrine, namely, a serf, all mankind are to Adam, apart from their individual wills. But in neither case has poison contaminated the blood. Yet, this is a doctrine that has found as wide a currency as the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; it is, in fact, an "orthodox" notion, an article of sectarian creeds. A certain writer, who died in the early 1870's, has some lines in which he depicts this depressing and injurious idea:

The heart's a black pollution;
Pest is in the breath;
Each limb's a dark conspirator,
Compassing our death;

The mind's a moral ulcer;
The veins with venom roll;
And life is one great treason
Of sense against the soul.

The seed of the serpent, germinating in all the thoughts and actions of man, is the most convenient excuse for his short comings. But though the tongue may charge them all to that account, the conscience smites and stings with the conviction that they might, if we would, have been avoided. It is in such a dogma that pious canting hypocrisy finds a grateful refuge, and boasts salvation sure according to the measure of the acknowledgment of its innate and helpless depravity.

But while the natural sense of right condemns this doctrine the contemptibleness of it becomes more and more manifest by analytical examination.

Assuming, then, that some dire poison, called sin, venomed all humanity, and debased them morally and physically, we have to inquire what is it they are compelled to do which is bad, and what it is they cannot perform which is good? Cannot a man refuse to lie, to swear, to get drunk, to commit adultery, to speak evil, to backbite, to give short weight, to sell a bad article, to deceive, to be idle, to incur debts, to be extravagant, to be a glutton, to be a brawler? In all matters of which our laws can take cognisance, nobody is ridiculous enough to contend that what is right cannot be adhered to. It is when we enter the domain of piety that our inborn feebleness, nay, helplessness, is thought to be discovered. Well, then, what is it that man can and cannot do? Can he not read his Bible: is it impossible to understand its general drift; can he not obey its first requirements; does anything bar him from the practice of devotion; is it impossible to increase in knowledge; can he not refrain from being hasty, and practice patience; does anything hinder prayer; nay, is there a single thing commanded of his Creator that this poor poisoned creature cannot do, or cannot avoid? Reader, to discover such thy search will be in vain.

The application of the precious blood of Christ for the washing away of sin is not material, but figurative; there is no actual washing; the heart is said to be sprinkled by faith. Even immersion in water is not intended to effect a literal purification of the flesh, but to bring back the answer of a good, or enlightened conscience, towards God, as the gracious result of an act of obedience commanded by Him. This idea of fixed poison, or serpent's seed, cannot be too vigorously exposed and emphatically denounced; it produces, as nearly as possible, what we may imagine the reality would be; it cripples all energy, paralyses all effort; it, in effect, blasphemes the goodness of God, impugns His wisdom, and turns His mercy into gall; while the creature of His hand is changed to a prone puppet, and lashed for his inevitable movements. The impression magnetises the man into the very obliquity he deplures, and evokes the tears and lamentations of a hypocrite. Awake, thou charmed sleeper, and Christ shall give thee light!

THE WOMAN'S SEED.

Seed stands for that which is begotten, as well as for seed properly so called. Hence, "the chosen seed;" "except the Lord of Sabaoth had given us a seed," and similar expressions.

The stress laid by Scripture on the fact that Christ was "made of a woman," is intended to exclude the idea of human paternity, but not of all paternity. It bars off the natural in order to prepare our minds for the divine. It implies the appointment of "another seed" outside the male line: "that which is begotten in her is of the Holy Spirit." This "holy thing, begotten by God, may be properly called God's seed, and this seed being born of Mary, is also her seed or son. "She brought forth her first born son," yet this child is called "the son of God."

There was no virtue in the woman that the Christ should proceed from her and not from the man also; so that had it been requisite for Him to appear in what has been termed "unclean flesh," His being of the woman was of no advantage, for her flesh was like the flesh of the man. While, therefore, Jesus is called "her seed,"

we must look for another reason than that of identity of flesh in excluding the participation of the man in His production.

Nothing can be more evident, to one who calmly looks at this matter, than that the intervention of God was not designed to create an offspring whose flesh should differ from that of ordinary generation; but that He might be “in the likeness of sin’s flesh” without being made sin’s flesh in His birth. All we are “made sinners” in this way, or by this means; if, therefore, the promised seed was not a sinner by any means, He was clearly not an inheritor, as we are, of all or any of the consequences which flow from such a connection.

The woman’s seed, or that which she conceived, had no relation to sin, or to sinners, except, first, in being made a sin offering; and, second, in partaking of the nature common to us all. And no doctrine is more insisted on by the Scripture than that of His necessary separation and stainlessness, in order that He might put away sin, or, in figurative language, “bruise the serpent’s head.” But, if He were the serpent’s seed, then the serpent bruises his own head, which falsifies the prediction assigning that work to the seed of the woman, and presents to us an unheard-of spectacle.

The elect are chosen from the world, or out of the seed of the serpent, but when the transfer has been made, they are no longer allied to their former brethren in sin. To use another scripture figure, they are translated from Satan into the kingdom of God’s dear Son. It will not be maintained that He is now under Satan; hence they, being His brethren, have already been delivered, but their perfection is a future work. Wild by nature, they have been grafted on to the true olive; they are not now a degenerate seed, but a seed of Deity begotten by the word of truth. What they have become by adoption, their Elder Brother and Redeemer was by birth and obedience. By the mother He was related to them; by the Father separate from their fate in order that He might buy them off; to do this He gave Himself. We have no account of Christ being adopted; but we have all received the adoption of sons. Moses was faithful as a servant; but Christ as a Son over His own house. God decreed Him to be His son, that we, through Him, might receive the atonement; so that we are now no more servants or slaves, but sons, and can, like Christ, cry Abba, Father.

No son of Adam is perfectly righteous before God, though some are said to have been righteous, and to have walked in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless; nevertheless, these noble exceptions were as much in bondage to sin, through Adam, as Judas himself; and their righteousness could never release them; they were at best but obedient slaves, and needed one free-born to ransom them from the power of the grave.

All the seed of the serpent are under “the law of sin and death,” but the woman’s seed are not under that law; for the Spirit’s law of life in Christ Jesus has made them free from the law of sin and death. This “law of life” was always in Christ, there was never a point of time after His birth when it was not in Him; on the other hand, we have not a tittle of testimony that He was ever under the other law. This shows the relative positions of the two seeds, and makes it evident that those who say that Christ was the serpent’s seed, neither understand what they say, nor whereof they affirm. From whatever denied mankind Christ was free, whether it were law or individual deeds. Perfect obedience, on the basis of an undefiled existence, made resurrection unto eternal life sure; but obedience, on the basis of an existence defiled would, as regards a future life, be labour in vain. Hence, it is imperative to redeem mankind before they can begin, with any chance of success, the race for eternal life. Make the tree good and then its fruit will be good; let us see that the Father placed Christ in a position which rendered the accomplishment of His divine mission possible, and that we must accept God’s way of righteousness; then it is easy to comprehend how, by holiness of conduct afterwards, He and we may gain the prize.

To make the Redeemer a slave, and get out of the consequent difficulty by saying that if God so decreed we ought to believe it, is to abandon the reason which God has given us wherewith to understand His purposes. God never wills what is contrary to justice, and common sense tells us that such an idea is at once unjust and absurd.

The woman’s seed is styled by Isaiah, chap. liii. 1, 2, the seed of Jehovah, “To whom is the seed of Jehovah revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of dry ground.” The Hebrew word is badly rendered here arm: the after words grow, plant, and root, show that it should be seed, not arm. It is the same word given in Genesis, where the seed in the ground is spoken of. The same letters,

do mean arm, but not in such a connection as this in Isaiah. This was a holy seed, and when developed was called a holy thing.

In the “seed of Elohim,” (c.v., a godly seed) mentioned by Malachi in chapter ii. 15, there is a probable allusion to Christ; as also in the “seed of Ail” spoken of in Hosea.

CHAPTER VIII.

ADOPTION CONSIDERED.

Born Again.

“Adoption is an action whereby a man takes a person into his family, in order to make him part of it, acknowledges him for his son, and receives him into the number, and gives him a right to the privileges of his children.” - Cruden. The most remarkable instance in Scripture is the adoption of Moses by Pharaoh’s daughter. We have no information at hand concerning the Egyptian law, but probably it did not vary much from the after enactments of the Romans in this respect.

“By the old Roman law, the relation of father and son differed little from that of master and slave. Hence, if a person wished to adopt the son of another, the natural father transferred (mancipated) the boy to him by a formal sale before a competent magistrate, such as the praetor at Rome, and in the provinces before the governor. The father thus conveyed all his paternal rights, and the child from that moment became in all legal respects the child of the adoptive father. If the person to be adopted was his own master (*sui juris*), the mode of proceeding was by a legislative act of the people in the *comitia curiatae*. This was called *adrogatio*, from *rogare*, to propose a law. In the case of *adrogatio*, it was required that the adoptive father should have no children, and that he should have no reasonable hopes of any. In either case the adopted child became subject to the authority of his new father; passed into his family, name, and sacred rites; and was capable of succeeding to his property.

“Women could not adopt a child, for by adoption the adopted person came into the power, as it was expressed, of the adopter; and as a woman had not the parental power over her own children, she could not obtain it over those of another by any form of proceeding. Under the emperors it became the practice to effect *adrogatio* by an imperial rescript. But this practice was not introduced till after the time of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 188-161).

“There was also adoption by testament. C. Julius Caesar thus adopted his great nephew Octavius, until he received the appellation of Augustus, by which he is generally known. But this adoption by testament was not a proper adoption, and Augustus had his testamentary adoption confirmed by a *lex curiata*.

“The legislation of Justinian (Inst. i. 11) altered the old law of adoption in several respects. It declares that there are two kinds of adoption; one called *adrogatio*, when by a rescript of the emperor (*principali rescripto*) a person adopts another who is free from parental control; the other, when by the authority of the magistrate (*imperio magistratus*), he who is under the control of his parents is made over by that parent to another person, and adopted by him either as his son, his grandson, or a relation, in any inferior degree. Females also, might be adopted in the same manner. But when a man gave his child to be adopted by a stranger, none of the parental authority passed from the natural to the adoptive father; the only effect was, that the child succeeded to the inheritance of the latter if he died intestate. It was only when the adopter was the child’s paternal or maternal grandfather, or otherwise so related to him as that the natural law (*naturalia jura*) concurred with that of adoption, that the new connexion became in all respects the same with the original one. It was also declared that the adopter should be at least eighteen years older than the person whom he adopted. Women who had lost their own children by death, might, by the indulgence of the emperor, receive those of others in their place.

“Adoption was no part of the old German law: it was introduced into Germany with the Roman law, in the latter part of the middle ages. The general rules concerning adoption in Germany are the same, but there are some variations established by the law of the several states.

“The French law of adoption is contained in eighth title of the first book of the ‘Code Civil.’ The following are its principal provisions: Adoption is only permitted to persons above the age of fifty, who have neither children nor other legitimate descendants, and are at least fifteen years older than the individual adopted. It can only be exercised in favour of one who has been an object of the adopter’s constant care, for at least six years during minority, or of one who has saved the life of the adopter in battle, from fire, or from drowning. In the latter cases the only restriction respecting the age of the parties is, that the adopter shall be older than the adopted, and shall have attained his majority, or his twenty-first year; and if married, that his wife is a consenting party. In every case the party adopted must be of the age of twenty-one. The form is for the two parties to present themselves before the justice of the peace (*judge de paix*) for the place where the adopter resides, and in his presence to pass an act of mutual consent; after which the transaction, before being accounted valid, must be approved of by the tribunal of first instance within whose jurisdiction the domicile of the adopter is. The adopted takes the name of the adopter in addition to his own; and no marriage can take place between the adopter and either the adopted or his descendants, or between two adopted children of the same individual, or between the adopted and any child who may be afterwards born to the adopter, or between the one party and the wife of the other. The adopted acquires no right of succession to the property of any relation of the adopter; but in regard to the property of the adopter himself, it is declared that he shall have exactly the same right with a child born in wedlock, even although there should be other children born in wedlock after his adoption. It has been decided in the French court that aliens cannot be adopted.

“Adoption is still practised both among the Turks and among the eastern nations. There is no adoption in the English or Scotch law.”

Those of our readers whose access to books is not easy will be pleased with this epitome of the laws of adoption. It shows that the Creator has spoken to man somewhat in agreement with man’s own measures. Adoption is made a prominent feature by Paul, and it is evident that he treats the subject in several leading particulars in accordance with this digest of Roman law. From the moment of adoption in the gospel sense, as well as in the Roman, the child in all legal respects belongs to the adoptive Father, and is subject to his new Father’s authority. He passes into His family, name, and sacred rites; and is capable of succeeding to his Father’s property.

Prior to this the child might be either the free born son of his natural father, or a slave. In the eye of the gospel of deliverance all the natural born children of Adam are slaves - made slaves by him who was the first sinner, and therefore “made sinners.” “All have sinned (in him) and come short of the glory of God.” We are all sons of God in a certain respect, for He created us and His breath is in our nostrils. But in a spiritual sense we are not His sons, for we have all been sold under sin. In this sense, then, sin is our lord, nor can we be adopted into the family of God except we are first justified from sin by faith.

It is by faith in Christ the natural born heir of the Deity, that we are adopted into His Father’s family; “for ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” Gal. iii. 26. God sent forth His Son . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons.” - Gal. iv. 4, 5. Whence it is plain that apart from such adoption we are not sons; and if not sons we are not free, and not being free we are in bondage. But the Deliverer was never in bondage. God sent forth His Son, not His slave, and through Him we are received into the family. This Son’s relationship to us arose out of the circumstance that He was “made of a woman.” His being “under law” was needful that He might be proved as those who were under it. To be “under law” is not to be cursed by law, but to be thus placed for trial and perfection. Adam was “under law” while obedient; but while obedient, he was not in bondage. Bondage results from breaking the law we are under, not from keeping it. The Redeemer, therefore, having scrupulously kept the law under which He was born, was free from all condemnation.

Because of adoption “God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” This use of the Syriac word Abba in connection with the Greek word Pater (father), arising from a habit of the Jews in writing after they became acquainted with Greek, is to be understood from Paul to mean this: he

who is adopted can now address God and say, My Lord, and my Father, whereas before adoption he could not so address Him.

When the prophet wrote the words: "After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people," there was an intended allusion to the adopted "sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty;" as may be seen from Hebrews x. 16. The choice God made of Israel at the first was prospectively an adoption through Christ. Indeed, the necessity of the Creator, He being the Redeemer, to relate Himself by blood to all mankind, which He did through His own Son, proves that Israel were not chosen outside this purpose. He, the One Supreme, is not a Being of blood, therefore, His own proper blood could not be poured out, but the blood of His own Son, styled "His own blood" (Acts xx. 28), constituted the connecting link. That this Son was the hope of the faithful in Israel appears from the saying of Paul concerning Moses, who at manhood refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, "esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt, for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward."

So that, whether we look at the scheme in relation to the Jews or the Gentiles, the truth is manifest that through His Son the Deity predetermined to adopt into His own spiritual family as many as would receive Him, thereby abolishing the slavery under which they were held. The effect of this transfer was complete, being on the basis of justification by faith from all their own past sins as well as from the sin imputed to them in the Garden of Eden. As for the Jews, they were not merely liberated from the further observance of their law, which had served the purpose of a schoolmaster to bring them as far as Christ, but were disenthralled, as they required to be like all other men, from the first and universal chain.

In this comprehensive view of the condition of mankind the words of John strike us with a peculiar force, producing an effect of gratitude and peace. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power (right or privilege) to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This glorious power operated through Him to whom it had been given by His Father. It was neither more nor less than the power of Sonship. It was this that gave Christ His adoptive strength, which, when imparted to the understanding of the poor bondmen in Adam, who are all their life in fear of death, makes them rejoice with the apostle, saying, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. Beloved, now are we the sons of God."

Before this acceptance in Christ not the Gentiles only but the Jews also were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." For it was the promise, not the law, that offered life and inheritance; but what was the promise without the seed to whom it was made?

The position of the Jew has been treated as though it had stood from all time, that is to say, it has not been made plain and prominent that the purport of the Abrahamic promise was its adoptive power through the coming Christ. The promise was 480 years before the law; and the divine prophecy, "I WILL BE WHO I WILL BE," was given to Israel before they reached Sinai's foot. Israel, in their chosen state, were a miniature of the whole family of God when adopted through His own Son. They were a forecast of the Tabernacle of Jehovah with men, standing in contrast with the surrounding world of Adam's sons groaning in their chains, and seeking deliverance from their idol gods, the work of their own hands, who could neither see, nor hear, nor walk. In this living picture we recognise two families, the family of God, and the family of Satan, and the entrance of proselytes by circumcision, foreshadowed the grand season of adoption, by "the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead."

The ceremonial of adoption consists in an acknowledgment of our enslaved state, the recognition of Jesus as the God-provided Redeemer, immersion for induction into the name He bears, and steadfast hope of the inheritance defined in the Word.

This being accomplished, we are divinely entitled to partake of the emblems of His body and blood, broken and shed in the grand redemptive work, and henceforward are consoled with the peculiar advantages

and blessings which our freedom or sonship justly confers. "We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but we have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." We are now, therefore, as regards relationship to the Deity placed on a level with Him who was born the Heir.

Let us briefly consider our new position. What is to be looked for now? In the first place, chastisement. "For whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." The object of this is that we may "be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live." Our heavenly Father does not chastise all in like manner, but in proportion to their disobedience. Let not those, therefore, who are severely tried think too highly of themselves as though they were their Father's special favourites; but rather judge that such treatment is the just consequence of their short comings. Besides this, trial, of various measure, is needful to the purification of character and the consolidation of all virtue.

Upon this subject there is much misapprehension. Some, through divers indiscretions, burden and embarrass themselves, and then by pious self-esteem attribute their sufferings to God, while it is as natural that they should suffer as that they should get wet by jumping into a river; and it would be as rational to regard such a drenching as a special chastisement of God as to so look upon the trouble they, through imprudence, bring upon themselves. The trials of God's children arise from unforeseen circumstances, losses, bereavements, persecution for Christ's sake. "Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them that are exercised thereby."

But we have also the assurance of God's protecting care. "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him: no good will be withheld from them that walk uprightly: light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart: the Lord shall preserve thee from all evil: He shall preserve thy soul. God heareth us and answereth our prayers." "And this is the confidence that we have in Him, that, if we ask anything according to His will, He heareth us; and if we know that He hears us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him." These, then are, in brief, the advantages of adoption into the family of God.

But what is all this in comparison of the final result? That which Paul styles "the redemption of our body" is the grand triumph. The healthy and strong may rejoice in this prospect, but it is the sick and afflicted, the aged and infirm who yearn in a peculiar manner for this redemption. Those whose crippled limbs, failing breath, dim sight, overwrought or bewildered mind - these are they who heave the deep sighs, yea, "groan" as the apostle saith, "within themselves, waiting for the adoption; to wit, the redemption of their body."

Still, between robust health and deathlessness the chasm is infinitely wider than between health and decrepitude. Who can describe the flash of exultation when "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the dead shall be raised incorruptible?" And this unutterable bliss will be magnified by association. Not only ourselves and many friends whose companionship we valued, and whom we laid with bitter tears in the ground, but the grand historic characters of antiquity, the sojourners and pilgrims of the same faith and hope, the first martyrs, and among them all the great Martyr, Jesus, shall we behold. These, like bright groups of stars encircling the moon, or diamond dew sparkling on the grass and herbs, will fill our wondering sight and make us feel ashamed of our past troubles as altogether unworthy to be named in view of our "exceeding great reward." Let these joyous thoughts quicken our nagging pace. As we near the prize the eye should grow brighter, the fire glow more ardently, so that we may not seem to be expecting that for which we do not strive.

BORN AGAIN.

This expression occurs only four times in the Scriptures, in John and Peter. The puzzle it was to Nicodemus, when it fell from the lips of Jesus, shows that it cannot be taken in a natural sense, and that the ruler did not comprehend its spiritual meaning. The terms in which all its significance is couched are these: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." But these terms must be understood before their import can be grasped. Popular instruction allots but a scanty need to this remarkable saying, and dismisses it by reference to a plunge in the

waters of baptism, or even the use of a few drops, and a sensation of the Holy Ghost in the heart. It deserves, however, a more deliberate enquiry and a more extensive use of our reasoning faculties.

It is evident that, whether birth be natural or spiritual there must first be begettal, conception, and gestation; and that unless these processes are correctly carried out abortion or idiocy will ensue. We would not, however, strain the analogy, still we cannot discard all resemblance except at the risk of ruining the Divine teaching.

Our utter dependence on God for deliverance from death is seen in nothing with more clearness than in this subject of spiritual begettal. This figure declares to man his absolute helplessness in the work of his own salvation; that is to say, he cannot take the first step in the matter; though when this step is taken he can work with advantage. What we mean now is shewn in the fact that no one can beget himself; no one can be the author of his own conception and birth. So it is spiritually; and, inasmuch as without these things there can be no offspring, so it is impossible that any man can cause himself to become a child of God.

“Faith cometh by hearing the word of God.” What the womb is to natural seed, so is the ear to the word of God. That word is seed, spiritually speaking, and the Almighty is the sower of it: “of his own will begat He us with the word of truth. “When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart.”

The “word of the kingdom” proceeds from God; it is not the word of man, and where this has not been sown it can bring forth no fruit; but where it is sown, and nourished in the affections, it “brings forth fruit unto eternal life.” Hence the logical deduction is, that eternal life is the result of the “word of the kingdom.”

From this conclusion it will be allowed at once that success or failure depends, in the first place, solely upon the quality of the seed sown. Bad seed cannot produce good fruit. The first enquiry, therefore, into the saying of Jesus - “Born again” - is an enquiry into the nature of the seed, or “the word of the kingdom.” This phrase - “the word of the kingdom” - is a partial definition of the nature of the seed; explaining that the word is concerning a kingdom; or, still employing the figure of speech, the seed sown will become a world-wide Theocracy in its harvest time.

This doctrine is as old as the Bible itself. Jesus borrowed it from ancient seers. “The Lord shall be king over all the earth.” Zec. xiv. 9. “I shall give thee (Christ) the nations (c.v. heathen) for thine inheritance.” Psal. ii. 8. “The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom.” Dan. ii. 44. “And there was given Him (Christ) dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that ALL PEOPLE, NATIONS, and languages should serve Him” (Christ). Dan. vii. 14. And the same prophetic Spirit, speaking to John in the Isle of Patmos, saith, “The kingdoms of THIS WORLD are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever.” Rev. xi. 15.

In view of testimony so plain it is passing strange to see “ministers of the gospel” sowing seed destined to bear fruit “beyond the starry sky;” and stranger still to hear some teaching both the one thing and the other. These are certainly two different seeds; one is “the good seed,” or “word of the kingdom to be set up over all the earth;” the other “tares,” or the word of the old pagan philosophers, not once mentioned by the prophets, Jesus, or the apostles. Among the four hundred or more occurrences of the word heaven, in the Scriptures, no allusion whatever is made to it as a place of abode in reserve for man. But instead of being invited there by God, he is told he cannot go. The harvest, therefore, which is certain to follow the sowing of such seed, will be a harvest of disappointment. God has nowhere sowed it, and will not follow it with His blessing.

After the seed has fallen into a “good and honest heart,” it begins, imperceptibly for a while, to develop; till at length the bearer finds himself impelled by these new ideas to corresponding action. This is traceable to the occasion on which he “received seed.” Having followed the counsel of Christ - “Seek first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness” - he is now induced to consider the meaning of the latter - “His righteousness” - in order that, by the ordinance of baptism, he may give evidence that he has “put on the righteousness of God.” Being taught by the prophets and apostles that Christ is our righteousness, He weighs the facts and needs in connection with Christ. First, He is God’s own and only begotten Son. Second, He is sent into the world to do His Father’s will - to shew to man the possibility of overcoming sin. Third, He is to

be a sufficient sacrifice for the whole world. Fourth, His death must be a voluntary offering in order to be acceptable to God. Fifth, This offering must itself be without spot. Sixth, Having paid the ransom He rises to immortality as the just reward of His obedience. Seventh, He is exalted to priesthood in the presence of God, to mediate on behalf of those who accept His ransom.

These ideas duly elaborated in his own mind, our candidate for immortal honours perceives himself to have developed so far in the knowledge of the gospel as to be aware of his own nakedness and want of covering, so as to be accounted holy in the sight of God, - "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." The eternal Spirit has instituted but one mode of investiture. The mystical waters are before him, and his ardent cry is, - "See, here is water; what doth hinder ME to be baptized?" The answering voice saith, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." And he rejoins, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God."

Reflection may suggest the peculiar fitness of the simple rite. Several things are implied. First, Crucifixion. Second, Death. Third, Burial. Fourth, Resurrection. Fifth, New Life. All these again afford separately matter for thought. Besides, as the ordinance is a figurative, not a real, death; it is seen to be figurative of a washing and clothing also. The intelligent subject of it is washed. He was as scarlet, he is like snow; he was as crimson, he is like wool. He was as filthy; he is esteemed as clean. To the household of God he was a stranger, he is now a citizen. He was a member of the Body of Adam; he is now a member of the Body of Christ. He had no part in the covenanted inheritance; he is now a king and a priest elect, awaiting promotion to power and glory. Having entered morally and doctrinally upon a new life, he now lives by faith on the Son of God who gave Himself for him.

He is nourished from day to day on "that bread which came down from heaven," whereof if a man eat he "shall not die in the age." (c.v. never). Every first day he visibly expresses his relation to his new Master, by eating and drinking the symbols of His sacrifice, and binding himself to Him by every cord of memory, and he is especially careful not to neglect this feast at which this Son and Redeemer is ever present by His appointed emblems. In his new life he shines as a light in the world. Men behold the integrity of his walk, the wisdom and prudence of his ways: all within the circle of his being are stimulated by his excellent example. He is part of the "salt of the earth," and through him men are induced to inquire after Christ. He is intellectually and morally "born again," yea, "born of the Spirit." "The words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life." "Of God's own will ye are begotten by the word of truth."

"The words I speak are spirit." Evidently this saying demands explanation. Words themselves are only sounds produced by the passing of breath, or air, over the larynx or organs of the throat, called the vocal chords. We would paraphrase thus: "The words I speak, are "able to transform men into "spirit." None of the many allusions to spirit in the Scripture reveal to us what spirit is. God is spirit, but not knowing what spirit is, we do not know what God is. We cannot find out God by searching. Flesh is known; it has been examined, and its composition demonstrated; but spirit is a mystery still. We know, however, that when applied to flesh it is capable of making it immortal; Jesus became immortal flesh and bone. Though spirit, He is not a phantom; "for a phantom," said He, "hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have." What He now is all must be, or they cannot enter the kingdom of God; - a sufficient proof, surely, that none are in that kingdom now. Jesus did not tell Nicodemus that he must be disembodied in order to enter the kingdom; but that he must "be born of the Spirit;" afterwards shewing that by such birth Nicodemus would become spirit; "that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit."

"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou nearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Thus our version renders the original of John iii. 8. But this translation of the Greek word *pneuma* by the English word wind in this passage does not appear at all satisfactory. The word is the same at the end of the verse as at the beginning; why not have said therefore, "so is every one that is born of the wind," if wind be correct in the first instance? But it is not a fact that "the wind bloweth where it listeth," or willeth, for it can have no will in the matter; besides, to hear the sound of the wind can be of no spiritual benefit. Let us read it thus:

"The spirit breathes where he wills, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

The following are Wiclif's translation, A.D. 1380, and the Rheims translation of 1582: -

WICLIF.

“The spirit brethith where he wole, thou herist his vois, but thou woost not fro whennes he cometh, ne whider he goith, so is ecche man that is borun of the Spirit.”

RHEIMS.

“The spirit breatheth where he vvil, and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he commeth and wither he goeth, so is eury one that is borne of the Spirit.”

The Eternal Spirit had breathed on Jesus, and Nicodemus heard the sound of His voice. This was the fullest measure of the Spirit, or rather Spirit unmeasured, while the same thing in a measured form was heard in the prophets and apostles. None living can explain this mysterious motive power, but even a child may be struck with its effects. Here is a mental birth of the Spirit experienced by men in the flesh; but the physical birth will change the flesh itself. Why should incorruptible flesh be thought impossible with God? Is it a greater marvel than the frame-work of the universe? Is it more wonderful than the globe itself, flying noiseless as a soap-bubble through the air? We have seen the one but not the other; there is the difficulty. Nevertheless we possess the testimony of credible men who did see; the rest remains for faith, Jesus seems to be the only one of the dead who has been raised to immortality. The world's future is suspended on this single fact. Were it a moment doubtful we should be like some rushing comet in the trackless sky.

But though unseen, except for forty days, Jesus did more terrible work after He was “born again” than He did before. Indeed, while in the flesh He was harmless to the world, but no sooner “in the Spirit” than the work of vengeance began. It would seem that this was a foreshadowing of things to occur when those of whom were “the first fruits” shall rise and shake themselves from the dust. There is no thought so startling as that of the rising of the dead! It was the agitation of the disciples, after Jesus had gone up into heaven, that maddened the Jews and Romans. Through this His absence was more dangerous than His presence. The first birth was a shock to His enemies, but the second infinitely greater. By murdering Him they had, as it were, hastened the day of His power and brought upon them His vengeance.

“Born again!” was now the new cry of His disciples. Everywhere they shouted, “He is risen from the dead! He is alive! We have seen Him!” This was the death-knell of the Jewish Commonwealth, and the doom of Pagan Rome. This voice went out to the ends of the world. The earth moved, the mountains were shaken, the foundations of the temples were loosened, the doors dropped from their hinges, and the idol images staggered, fell, and were dashed to pieces. He who was risen sat in the heavens guiding the tide of war, and His friends went forth “conquering and to conquer.” The idol deities had prophesied many things, but they had not foretold their own ruin by a man who should be born again. This birth of Spirit they knew not of, or denied; now their votaries “heard the sound of His voice,” like the subterranean thunder that precedes the earthquake, but they could not tell whence it was, and whither it went. We have endeavoured to sketch the process, and indicate some of the results which follow from being “born again.”

CHAPTER IX.

CONCERNING ELECTION.

This is a subject upon which very little has been said among us. It almost seems to have been left over to “orthodoxy,” as not worthy of being examined; at any rate, it has been neglected. The dissension and trouble it has caused in “the Christian world,” may to some be an admonition that it is best let alone. There is no reason, however, why it should not be temperately entered upon; and the prominence given to it by the apostle, is a good and sufficient ground for making it a matter of careful study. Notwithstanding the obscurities which heated controversy has heaped upon the subject, we cannot, upon calm reflection, maintain that the apostle's language is necessarily dark, or that he did not intend those to whom it was addressed to understand it. Surely is it but reasonable to infer that he designed it to be comprehended, and that it was comprehended.

First, then, as to the term Elect. Eligere is the Latin word from which it springs, consisting of e, out, and legere, to gather, to choose. Hence, to pick out, to select from among a number, to make choice of; to fix upon by preference; to choose; to prefer. Some use expressions as though they had contrary meanings; one sense in secular usage, and another in theology; but we are not ready to allow this to be correct. We believe the Scripture to employ the word elect according to its definition as above given, which is undoubtedly the true one. We, therefore, shall neither frame nor adopt a theory of election, and then make the Bible a text-book to support that theory; but shall proceed in quite the opposite direction; namely, take the proper meaning of the word, apply it to the passage where the word is found, and abide by the conclusion to which we are brought by this method.

“Behold my servant, whom I uphold” - or upon whom I lean, in reference to the eastern custom of kings leaning on the arm of their trusty servants - “mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth.” Isaiah xlii. 1. By the general consent of Jews and Christians this passage speaks of the Christ. He is presented beforehand as Jehovah’s chosen one; His elect upon whom He poured out His spirit for the preaching of the good news of the kingdom, and the performance of many mighty works. Luke iv. 18, 19. But it ought not to be concluded that, because the Father made choice of His own Son for the work assigned to Him according to the prophet, and repeated by Luke, that His elect had no power to do otherwise. The struggle betwixt Jesus’ “own will,” or natural inclination, and the will of His Father, is sufficient to prove the possibility of failure, or even disobedience. “Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done.” Luke xxii. 42. The natural inclination led Him to turn away from the horrors of that cup; but the Father’s will was that He should drain its bitterness to the dregs. To say, “not my will,” if there were no will, no power to refuse, is a mockery too solemn to find credence, at least where reason is not absent. “I came down from heaven not to do mine own will” (John vi. 38), which implies He might have done it, if He had sought; but He said, “I seek not mine own will.” “My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work.” “If any man will do His will,” which leaves it to the option of the man who knows what that will is.

“Our voluntary service He requires,
Not our necessitated; such with Him
Finds no acceptance, nor can find; for how
Can hearts not free, be tried whether they serve
Willing or no, who will but what they must
By destiny, and can no other choose?” - Milton.

The idea that Christ was to God something like what an axe is to a wood-cutter, finds no countenance in the Scripture doctrine of election. The above testimony goes to shew that Jesus was an instrument only in the sense of being a willing agent. But if the other were the signification, it would follow that the love the Father had for Him was of the same nature as that which the wood-cutter has for a good axe; that is to say, of no higher character, thereby excluding all love on the part of the instrument towards its owner. This is the certain out-come of the doctrine; it renders foolish and nugatory all that is recorded in the Psalms, the Prophets, and the New Testament, of the trial, love, pity, and joy of this obedient Son.

But we must regard this Elect One with a discriminating eye. He differed from all the other elect in this respect, that besides being God’s chosen one. He was also His own Son; so that sonship, in his case, is one thing, and election another. Begettal first, then choice. God begat a Son that He might choose Him to fulfil His purposes; but the Son was not absolutely compelled to fulfil those purposes because He was begotten. On the other hand, unless He had been a begotten Son to the Father, He would have had no power to do His will in this matter; for it is a self-evident proposition that none but one who is free-born can give freedom to those who desire it.

“Mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there.” Isaiah lxxv. 9. This sets forth the purpose of God to place His chosen servants upon the land of Israel, for the reference is to Jerusalem and Palestine. The testimony points to a still future inheritance, but our present argument is not affected at all by that; it would stand precisely the same if the prophet had been speaking of the first possession of Canaan; for while it is true that the inheritance is the result of their election, it is equally true that their election is not devoid of all conditions; so that the possession of the land arises out of their compliance with the conditions on which they were elected by God. Concerning the future settlement, the apostle shews that, although it is determined by God, it is not an absolute decree having no relation to circumstances, but that it is a decree

based upon conditions which God foresees will arise. But the Jews are surely not compelled to acquiesce in these stipulations just because God foresees they will do so; or else His foreknowledge would deprive all intelligent beings of will, and therefore of responsibility. "They also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graff them in again." Belief is the condition; and without belief God cannot, consistently with His decree, graft them in again.

"When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, even in the latter days, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and shalt be obedient unto His voice (for the Lord thy God is a merciful God), He will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which He sware unto them." Deut. iv. 30, 81. Here the conditions of choice are plainly stated, and irrespective of these there can be no inheritance in the latter days. Again in chap. vii. 9, 10: "Know therefore that the Lord thy God, He is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love Him and keep His commandments, to a thousand generations; and repayeth them that hate Him to their face." "As the nations which the Lord destroyeth before your face, so shall ye perish; because ye would not be obedient unto the voice of the Lord your God;" viii. 80. "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isaiah i. 19, 20.

To private individuals and their descendants the Almighty has applied the same principle upon which we have seen in the foregoing passages He deals with the whole nation. "And He said unto me, Solomon thy son, he shall build my house, and my courts, for I have chosen him to be my son, and I will be his father." But hear the terms on which all this rested: "If he be constant to do my commandments and my judgments, as at this day." 1 Ch. xxviii. 6, 7. Passages of the same tenor are very numerous, but it is not needful to cite more at present: these teach unmistakably that God's election is not an arbitrary act of supreme power only, but that is a decree 'based upon the fulfilment of clearly denned conditions, the parties themselves being free to comply or refuse.

The choice God made of the nation of Israel is always represented as exalting them to a great height above all other nations; but He whom God styles "my first born," Israel, Jesus, the Prince of God and Saviour of men, rode high above all His chosen nation. The honours to which they were elected He received by birth-right. They were chosen to a conditional inheritance; He was born to that inheritance, and could only lose it by disobedience. He, as the Heir to the estate ('whose right it is'), having established His right through every necessary form of trial, stands as the great Elector, offering the said estate upon His own terms. He being also the born Heir to eternal life, and having by obedience passed from the heirship into the possession, couples this unspeakable gift therewith. The great work of election, or taking out a people for His name, required that God, "in all things," should give the Elector the pre-eminence. Jehovah's first-born, Jesus, is "the beginning of His strength," "higher than the kings of the earth." Herein lies the primary elective power, the secondary, or conditional, belongs to the elected.

" in thee
As from a second root shall be restor'd
As many as are restor'd, without thee none."—Milton.

The principles of the gospel are in strict harmony with the doctrine of election thus far considered. The promised future wealth and glory of God are bound by certain stipulations, all of which imply the power of man to act up to them; and whoever teaches to the contrary, affirming man's inability so to act, does in effect construe divine election into fatalism. "To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honour and immortality God will render (verse 6) eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jews first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God." Rom. ii. 7-11. What indeed were the use of all this if we could not obey the truth? To obey the truth does not mean to obey part and part not obey, for that were "to obey unrighteousness." The promise and threat proceed on the clear understanding that the elect can perform every condition under which they are chosen, "according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. xvi. 26. "And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled." 2 Cor. x. 6. "Bringing every thought to the obedience of Christ." Verse 5. Whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness." Rom. vi. 16. "As ye have yielded your members servants to

uncleanness, even so now yield your members servants to righteousness.” Verse 19. “For your obedience is come abroad unto all men.” Chap. xvi. 19. “His inward affection is more abundant toward you whilst he remembereth the obedience of you all.” 2 Cor. vii. 15. Paul shows that Christ “wrought by him, to make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed.” Rom. xv. 18. He also wrote to the Corinthians, “that he might know the proof of them, whether they were obedient in all things.” 2 Cor. ii. 9.

Now, what is the teaching of these Scriptures? Is it that we cannot or that we can fulfil all obedience? The latter, unquestionably. To assert that we do not is no excuse, nor any proof that we cannot; but rather to declare our own condemnation in the face of God’s righteous commandments; and, as we before said, it establishes the doctrine of fate, than which nothing is more absurd, or more relaxing to morals. But none would protest against the sceptical doctrine of fate more than those who say we cannot render full obedience; although it is quite easy to shew that such is the issue of their own position; nay, worse, for the result is to bring in God, in whom they believe, as the author of their own faults. For as regards fate, it is but an empty sound, and when referred back to the laws of nature it implies in the clearest manner a legislator or maker of those laws; if therefore, man by reason of the law of his nature cannot obey righteousness, upon whom does the blame fall, but upon God, the maker of that law?

“ to persevere
He left it in thy power; ordain’d thy will
By nature free, not over-rul’d by fate
Inextricable, or strict necessity.” - Milton.

Indeed, though at first sight it may not be observed, the ground held by some, is level with that of heathenism, as derided by the old Greek poet:

“Perverse mankind! whose will, created free,
Charge all their woes on absolute decree:
All to the dooming gods their guilt translate,
And follies are miscalled the crimes of fate.”

But in considering the Scripture doctrine of election there are two points to be noticed; one, is the obedience for which we are chosen; the other, the obedience unto which we are elected. Though we have spoken of the first, it is the last which properly stands first in the Divine arrangement. Before we can possibly begin to work out our obedience, it is imperative that we be planted in the obedience of Jesus. Peter will help us to explain this matter: “Elect . . . unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.” Two things are mentioned, “Obedience” and the “sprinkling of the blood;” and unto these, in the order given by the apostle, were those to whom he wrote “elect.” This election places us on new standing ground; it causes us to change sides, or to use the English version of Colossians i. 18, to be “translated into the kingdom of God’s dear Son.” We -are, as it were, on “holy ground.” It is here we approach “the blood of sprinkling,” and beyond these limits not one drop can reach us. Being “elect” unto these things we are “made righteous.” There is no power in us, as of ourselves, to make us righteous; this is accomplished “by the righteousness of One,” even Jesus. Helplessly we were all “made sinners;” and equally so, in a certain sense, are we all “made righteous;” for, had not Christ already established “obedience and the blood of sprinkling,” there could neither be any election unto these, nor could any movement or desire on our part effect any help whatever. “By the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” This favour being bestowed, we are now commanded to act righteously. “He that doeth righteousness is righteous.”

When these two points are clearly seen, we are constrained to join the apostle, and exclude all boasting as touching our righteousness, as though it, of itself, were effectual in justifying us before God; with the Apocalyptic throng we exclaim: “UNTO HIM that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood; and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father to HIM be glory and dominion, for ever and ever. Amen.”

How then does the matter stand? We are parts of Christ’s mystical Body; that is to say, when we have been made such; not by birth. But in this process we are “made righteous,” so that we do not need, as members of His Body, to be made clean. Christ’s Body does not consist of unclean members, but of clean.

No one can become a member thereof who has not experienced “the washing of water by the word.” To become part of His Body, it is incumbent upon us to be cleansed and adopted by Him who came to cleanse us. It is possible for a washed and justified person to become denied, and so to defile the Body, thereby incurring a fearful vengeance, but this is no answer to the foregoing argument, which shews that at first it was needful to be made clean in order to induction into the Body. Subsequent defilement, therefore, rather establishes than breaks down the position.

That election is not arbitrary, but conditional, appears from Paul’s saying, that “without faith it is impossible to please God.” “O faithless generation, how long shall I suffer you?” This rebuke proves faith to have been within their own control; by vigilance it comes, by negligence it departs. No faith, no election, is a proposition easily supportable. “God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.” There is no choice, or election, without belief of the truth; hence it follows that the elect are believers. “Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, - but the election hath obtained it.” Who are these, but the believers? These are mentioned again in the same chapter: “Thou standest by faith. Be not highminded but fear.” The revelator saw a multitude of sealed ones; these he describes as having the Father’s name written in their foreheads; but the sealing did not precede the writing; it was the proper sequence to hearing and belief. “In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise.” “Then one said unto Him, Lord, are there few that be saved? And He said unto them, Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able.” They are not able because they do not believe, for it is written, “If thou believest, thou shalt be saved.” The elect, then, are the few who believe. “Many are called, but few are chosen;” which is only another way of saying, few there are that believe.

“For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” This, however, is not intended to convey that believers cannot be deceived, for it was to believers that Christ said, “take heed that no man deceive you;” and the apostle Paul, who was surely one of the elect, feared that, after having preached to others, he himself might be cast away. “The very elect” appears to mean here the actually saved; that is, those ultimately accepted, for the passage shows that to deceive them would be impossible. It is an expression used to describe the strong persuasiveness of the coming impostors, but not intended to teach that the elect cannot fall away.

There are several other texts on the subject of election upon which we have not touched, but which rigid Calvinism would never leave out of the discussion. The history of Moses and the reference of Paul to the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart by God are the favourite refuge of those who will have it that the Almighty makes wicked men as well as good men for Himself. Theodoret, the author of ecclesiastical history, has a happy observation in his commentary on this text. “What am I to understand,” he asks, “by God having hardened Pharaoh’s heart?” And after some other remarks he gives the following illustration: “The sun is said to melt wax and to harden mud, although it possesses only the property of giving heat; so the patience and goodness of God produce two contrary effects in different individuals, being useful to the one, and rendering the other more guilty; hence it is said that some are thus converted and others hardened.”

Another difficult passage is that of Rom. viii. 28-30, - “We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to His purpose, for whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, . . . Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.” On this text Milton writes as follows, which seems to us a very good handling of it:

“In the first place it must be remarked, that it appears from verse 28, that those who love God, are the same as those “who are the called according to His purpose,” and consequently as those “whom He did foreknow,” and “whom He did predestinate,” for them He also called, as is said in verse 30. Hence it is apparent that the apostle is here propounding the scheme and order of predestination in general, not of the predestination of certain individuals in preference to others. As if he had said, We know that all things work together for good to those who love God, that is, to those who believe, for those who love God believe in Him. The order of this scheme is also explained. First: God foreknew those who should believe, that is, He decreed or announced it as His pleasure, that it should be those alone who should find grace in His sight

through Christ, that is, all men if they would believe. These He predestined to salvation, and to this end, He, in various ways, called all mankind to believe, or, in other words, to acknowledge God in truth, those who actually thus believed He Justified; and those who continued in the faith unto the end He finally glorified. But that it may be more clear who those are whom God has foreknown, it must be observed that there are three ways in which any person or thing is said to be known of God. First, by His universal knowledge, as Acts XY. 18, "known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world." Secondly, by His approving or gracious knowledge, which is a Hebraism, and therefore requires more explanation. Exod. xxxiii. 12. "I know thee by name and thou hast also found grace in my sight." Psal. i. 6. "Jehovah knoweth the way of the righteous." Thirdly, by a knowledge attended with displeasure. Deut. xxxi. 21. "I know their imagination which they go about, &c. 2 Kings xix. 27. "I know . . . thy coming in, and thy rage against me." Matt. vii. 23, "I never knew you. " Rev. iii. 1. "I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead." In the passage under discussion it is evident that the approving knowledge of God can be alone intended; but He foreknew, or approved no one except in Christ, and no one in Christ except a believer." Hence, the sum of the matter is this, God has elected all who believe, and has glorified those who hold fast their belief to the end.

Next: we cite Rom. ix. 11, 12, 18, "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth; It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger." As it is written, "Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated." The view of this passage from which we differ, asserts that, all conditions out of account, God determined to love and save Jacob, while he also resolved to hate and curse Esau. But no power of asseveration can make this view of the matter avoid giving great offence to a mind at all tinctured with just ideas. To picture Divine love acting thus is to degrade it to what has been seen in Nero and Henry the Eighth.

Let us look carefully at the wording of the verse. God had declared the elder should serve the younger. Before they were born God said this, and He said it that the "purpose of election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth." But what is here intended by election? Is it the eternal and preordained salvation of Jacob and the eternal and preordained destruction of Esau? By no means. It is clearly an election to the privileges of a first-born, "The elder shall serve the younger." God foresaw that this would be so, and spoke of it; but it will not do to say, on that account, that God forced Esau to sell his birthright, or that He forced Jacob to lie and deceive his father Isaac. Neither, if we take the statement to refer to the nation, can we maintain that the perdition of Esau was thus decreed. Paul shews here that God determined to exclude all men from attributing their election to their own works. Election comes first, then works. The foreknowledge of God was written concerning Jacob and Esau before they were born; His determination that the younger should become the first born was also written; but He did not hate Esau and love Jacob before they had done anything. Paul does not say this; he merely points out the right God had of primogeniture; but this history of Jacob and Esau manifests that God's choice was conditional.

When Paul says, "As it is written," &c., he quotes from Malachi. Now, Malachi spoke of these two brothers, not before they were born; but long after they were dead. Neither does he speak of election; but simply calls the attention of his nation to the fact that, though Esau was Jacob's brother, yet God hated Esau. He then tells us how God's hatred was displayed. "I laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." And when the apostle mentions this hatred of God to Esau, he does not inform us that it existed while he and his brother were unborn; but adds it as a proof that what he had stated before about the election of the one and the rejection of the other, was true. But this does not prove that arbitrary love and hatred were in God's mind before the birth of Esau and Jacob; nor that it was thus after their birth. The sum of the matter is this: God foresaw what would be. He resolved thus and so according as he foresaw. His resolve was not arbitrary, but conditional. The lives of Esau and Jacob voluntarily produced these conditions, and the blessing and the curse followed in agreement therewith.

Paul anticipates the very objection which arises out of the supposed arbitrary power of God. "Why doth He yet find fault? for who hath resisted His will?" This question assumes that it was God's will to make Pharaoh wicked. But this is false. The wickedness was Pharaoh's; the mercy, endurance, and long suffering were God's. Upon such a man as Pharaoh this produced just what God foresaw it would. "I know," said God, "Pharaoh will not let you go." On a lower scale, we have many instances of this in the ordinary incidents of life. A son often construes the kindness and forbearance of his father into weakness, and so

continues reckless. An army interprets a retreat to mean fear, and pursues to its own destruction. Then why not have adopted other measures? This was the case. We behold both “the goodness and severity of God.” Under the latter, Pharaoh relented. Justice then demanded that the plague should be stayed; but no sooner was the plague stayed than this lenity hardened Pharaoh’s heart: to repeat Theodoret’s saying, “as the sun hardens mud, while by the same power it melts wax.” A calm consideration clears God from all cruelty or despotism, and shows both His justice and mercy all the more vividly by contrast with Pharaoh’s tyranny and rebellion.

CHAPTER X *

WHO, OR WHAT, WAS THE SERPENT THAT TEMPTED EVE?

Temptation of Christ Re-considered.

To question would require the transcription of many folios. By common readers, that is, by the great mass of professing Christians, the account in Genesis is passed over almost without inquiry; only a few pause to give their doubts and difficulties fair play. In the majority of cases, where the narrative of the temptation is taken in a literal sense, the strangeness of a speaking brute, an acutely reasoning beast, an ably argumentative reptile, is got over by the conclusion that nothing is too hard for the Almighty. But we ought not to solve or rather evade, a dark problem of moral science by considering, or simply looking at it from the point of view of what God can do. It is safe to say that the exercise of divine power never conflicts in the smallest degree with divine wisdom. While it is always easy enough to fall back upon infinite power, it is by no means easy in every instance to recognise infinite wisdom in the manner of its use. To rest satisfied with the mere assent that the All-powerful is alike the All-wise, is to avoid the exercise of our senses, and not to learn to discern between good and evil. It is the wisdom rather than the might of God’s doings in the moral and physical world that we should ever seek. The blind may stand in awe of power, but understanding is requisite to love as well as to fear God.

Our views on this subject have undergone a change. Like many others, we had never called in question the propriety of a strictly literal reading of the account of the serpent conversing with Eve and beguiling her. That had been taken for granted, and the consequences only had been more particularly dwelt upon. It is the recent consideration of these consequences that has given rise to new suggestions, and offered serious obstacles against the literal view of the case.

No class of believers in revealed religion has sought more than the class represented in these pages to show that the only Tempter is the lust of the flesh. The personality of the Devil has been more than ridiculed: it has been proved to be a blot on Divine goodness, wisdom, and power. Attention has been specially directed to the words of James – “When a man is tempted he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed.” This great fact has lately come back with fresh force, demanding a wider application than before. Its previous use, however, was all but universal. We do not recollect more than two cases to which it has not been applied as the sole cause of temptation, namely, the temptation of our first parents in Eden, and the temptation of Christ in the wilderness. And in both these scenes it has been partially acknowledged. This inner tempter now claims full sway. In our present judgment he needs neither rival nor helper. The question which presses is this. If the lusts of the flesh, ever since the earliest transgression, have been sufficient to entice, to draw away, and to destroy, why not in the first instance also? But if the lusts were not then strong enough without an external intelligence, why are they now strong enough, seeing that such intelligence, whether beast or angel, has no visible or known intercourse with man? In advocating the complete application of the principle, though room is only left in our belief for its more extended use in the trials of the first and second Adams, it is not improbable that we shall be accused of sapping the foundation of Wisdom’s House, and of cutting another mooring from the rock of Faith.

* *Written in Jersey, October, 1873. Subsequent thought has favoured the article, and we shall write more in detail hereafter.*

The word change is peculiarly detestable to some minds, and frequently not more so to any than to those who pride themselves on innovations the most radical. Such manifestations are indicative of a deeply rooted selfishness. The voice seems to cry, "Change by me, or no change." But the student of truth, whether natural or revealed, whether written in the rocks and flowers of the ocean, or inscribed by the finger of God on tables of stone, will utterly forget himself, acknowledge his past errors, and still press onward, rejoicing with humility in the discovery of the footprints of Divine wisdom.

The language of Oriental peoples is sometimes so highly figurative as to baffle any attempt to read it word for word in its adaptation to plain matter of fact. The object of parable and symbol is, we believe, to indicate a great truth rather than to express it in all its varied details; and while leaving many particulars concealed, still to portray the whole with more force than could be achieved by simple unfigurative discourse.

Coming to the subject itself, it will be necessary to establish several things before we can venture to read the account of the transaction of the serpent in Genesis altogether in a metaphorical sense. First, that sin is represented in the Scriptures by a serpent. Second, that the ways of a natural serpent and the ways of sin are similar. Third, that a serpent would be recognised by mankind in general as a fit symbol of danger and destruction. To the order in which these propositions are confirmed, there can be no valid objection. We propose to speak of the last first and the first last.

That the serpent has universally signified danger and destruction does not seem difficult to show. From Bryant, on Serpent Worship, we learn that this reptile was interwoven with nearly all the religious mysteries and ancient forms of worship. In almost every place there is some story of a remarkable serpent, just as in almost all countries there is a tradition of a great deluge. In some instances the creature is pictured with a human head. Chimera is portrayed by Hesiod as a dark-eyed female in the upper, and as a horrid serpent in the lower part. Homer describes it with a lion's head, a goat's body, and a dragon's tail. In both these figures an element of danger is visible. "The myth seems to have belonged to Asia minor, as gigantic carvings of the Chimera (on the rocks) are there found. The rationalistic account of the Chimera is, that it represented a mountain in Syria, whose top was the resort of lions, its middle of goats, and the marshy ground at the bottom of which abounded with serpents." The same element of danger is apparent in this symbol. The fact of the serpent having been an object of worship does not damage this idea, but rather supports it, for many objects of heathen worship have been sources of fear and conciliation, not of adoration and love. Danger to life from its very beginning seems to be figured in Phoenician Mythology by a serpent encircling an egg. The Greek legend of Medusa having her hair turned to serpents says it was for violating the Temple of Minerva. The serpent strangled by Hercules in his cradle seems to be of similar import to the serpent and the egg. The badge of Esculapius was a staff entwined by a serpent, typical of his power over disease. And Paul in Corinthians appears to allude to a serpent, in saying "the sting of death is sin."

The resemblance between the habits of the serpent and the sensual faculties of man, uncontrolled by God's laws, is readily observed. The manner of the serpent is to allure and fascinate its prey by its strong magnetic force before destroying it. This is the best possible symbol of sensual desire, which also, like the serpent, bewilders the eye of the understanding by its mazy coils and sinuosities. It is, therefore, said to be more "subtle" than any beast of the field; and the Scripture regarding man's heart as the seat of the affections and lusts, declares it to be deceitful and desperately wicked, and asks, who can know it? The literal reading of the temptation of Eve conveys something like an idea that the reptile was more intellectual than the woman, and so got the advantage of her in argument and persuasion. But no such comparative superiority could be established without a miracle; and, if due regard be paid to the mental constitution of man, there is no need for such miracle, not to speak of the astonishing supposition of God working a miracle for the temptation of man.

Sin is represented in scripture language by a serpent. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." There is no difference of opinion as to who is here intended by the woman's seed. He who was "made of a woman" fulfils the prophecy. It is hardly needful to remark that, whenever Christ performs this act. He does not crush the head of a literal serpent. By His death sin is put away, and the future abolition of death among the children of Adam will be the full accomplishment of this ancient prediction. The denunciation of the Pharisees by John and Jesus is further proof. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers." A viper is one of the

most venomous kind. The Pharisees were not literal serpents; but their cunning, their fascinating manners, the deadly poison of their traditions, making of none effect the word of God, were as much to be dreaded in a spiritual as vipers in a natural sense. The head of the mystery of iniquity is symbolized by a serpent. "That old serpent, the Devil and Satan." Now, the Devil and Satan are not, and never were, a literal serpent. Diabolos and Satan are names for sin in various forms, and for any person or thing adverse to God or man. The Devil and Satan are states of mind embodied in individuals and in communities.

The Hebrew word for serpent closely resembles the Hebrew word for liar, or deceiver, and the Samaritan copy has the word liar instead of the word serpent. This seems to agree with Jesus' saying recorded in John: "He was a liar from the beginning." But to put the word liar in the places in Genesis where the serpent occurs, does not make good sense; it mixes the literal and the allegorical in such a manner as to mar the account, while if it be received as strictly literal, the insertion of liar would make still worse of it. We prefer to take the verse in John as explanatory of the allegory in Moses.

Dr. Adam Clarke was perplexed with the serpent. He writes: "Who was the serpent? of what kind? In what way did he seduce the first happy pair?" These are questions which remain yet to be answered. The whole account is either a simple narrative of facts, or it is an allegory. Again, "if it is an allegory, no attempt should be made to explain it." We are surprised at this remark coming from such a learned and independent mind. An allegory is designed to instruct, or it is nothing worth; and we ought to do our best to comprehend it.

The apostle Paul in Galatians, says, "this Agar is Mount Sinai, in Arabia." It also appears to us correct to say this serpent is the sensual desires of the flesh. The colloquy attributed to the woman and the serpent, is just the sort of experience common to mankind when wavering between a known command and an inclination to break through the self-denial and restraint which are required to keep it. When Adam and Eve had actually transgressed they were the serpent just as much as the Pharisees whom John and Jesus styled serpents; and all their posterity, strictly speaking, are "the seed of the serpent." It is only when Christ comes into the world, in the nature of this seed, but God's Son, that "the seed of the woman" is seen. The fact that many of the serpent's seed are adopted into the family of "the woman's seed" helps rather than hurts this view of the case. Treating the matter as an allegory, the prostration of the serpent and his eating the dust would be understood to answer to the moral and legal degradation of Adam and Eve.

Having presented what we wrote a year ago, we now proceed to a further investigation of "the Fall." Let be it distinctly understood that the view now exhibited in nowise alters the design; that is to say, whether we regard the account as literal or figurative the lesson taught by it is the same namely, how sin and death came into the world. Far be it from us to deny that there were two persons named Adam and Eve; that there was a garden in Eden; that, among others, there were two trees called "the tree of life" and "the tree of knowledge of good and evil;" that there were beasts, birds, and fishes; that "the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." No: the literal truth of none of these things would we call in question; but we contend that several of the objects mentioned may be taken with much more reason as symbols of states of mind, results to be attained, and consequences to follow, than as literally performing and bestowing the things specified.

First of all. What was the tree of life? To this question there is no reply in the Scriptures. "Tree of life" is found in Genesis three times (ii. 9, hi. 22, 24) and four times in Proverbs (iii 18, xi. 80, xiii. 12, xv. 4); but we do not meet the phrase again till we come to Revelation, when it occurs three times (ii. 7, xxii. 2, 14): in all, "tree of life" is mentioned in the Scripture ten times. In seven out of the ten, namely, in Proverbs and Revelation, the phrase is used in a figurative sense, undoubtedly. Is there, then, any proof that in Genesis it is not also used figuratively. For our part we see none. There is no tree in the world known to possess the actual qualities which theologians ascribe to "the tree of life." Cruden says, "it was so called because it was a natural means of preserving man's life, and freeing him from all infirmities, diseases, and decays during his abode on earth, and also a sacramental pledge of his continuance in that life upon condition of his perfect obedience." Any tree the Almighty chose to select for the purpose of teaching obedience would avail, and while obedience lasted the promise of life would be made good; but this does not need the belief that the tree itself possessed the power to confer immunity from decay, and the ultimate bestowment of eternal life; nor, on the other hand, is it requisite to suppose that the tree called "the tree of knowledge of good and evil" contained within itself, as a natural property, the faculty of imparting a knowledge of good and evil. To estimate these two trees thus seems to amount to the bringing in of an unnecessary miracle, and to the setting

up of something in nature contrary to nature itself. A miracle will, indeed, bridge over any chasm, however wide, but the Creator never constructs such means of passage when ordinary modes are adequate. We repeat, that any fruit-bearing trees would answer the end, and with regard to posterity the picture appears to us to be a most striking representation of the manner in which the death of man entered our world. If a conjecture be allowable, we would suggest the vine as the probable "tree of life." The real "Tree of Life" styled Himself "The Vine," "I am the Vine." The olive tree is a world-wide emblem of peace; but nobody dreams that, either by drinking olive oil, or by eating olives, peace is secured. Two trees would be a more tangible means of impressing upon the undeveloped minds of the first human pair God's lesson than an abstract command. The observance or neglect of duty would be well portrayed, but there would be no occasion to impute miraculous results to the trees so employed. Philo and Josephus, both Jewish historians, state that their nation took the narrative allegorically, but we need not endorse all the fancies of Philo on the subject. Many learned men among the moderns in "the Church," and out of it, have considered the story figurative too. This view does seem to us, after some thought, to be quite rational, and to combine the two advantages of teaching the truth of history, and of avoiding useless miracles and things which jar upon "reason's ear." The apocalyptic "tree of life" is certainly none other than Christ Himself. To eat of the tree is a figurative expression, signifying to be made deathless, like Christ.

The trees of Ezekiel, standing on either bank of the water of life that "flows fast by the oracle of God," yielding their monthly fruit, and shedding their healing leaves, while, probably, setting forth topographical transformations, will hardly be imagined to be literally feeding the wants and curing the diseases of mankind; but as "trees of righteousness," or immortal kings and priests governing the world's affairs, standing in new Mosaic order in their courses, new moons and sabbaths, enforcing wise laws, stimulating obedience, and enlightening the darkness of men, they may be beautifully pictured as trees - which do not fade, and whose leaves are ever green. There is, indeed, no book which abounds more in figure than the Bible. Figure was the common medium of instruction adopted by Moses, the Prophets, and Christ. "Give ear, O ye heavens, hear, O earth, My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew," was the manner of Moses' address to the assembled rulers and people. "Ho, to the multitude of many people, which make a noise like the noise of the seas; and to the rushing of nations, that make a rushing like the rushing of mighty waters, but God shall rebuke them, and they shall flee far off, and shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the wind, and like a rolling thing before the whirlwind." (Lowth's translation). Thus speaks Isaiah. To this the reader may add for himself the parables of Christ and the imagery of John.

"The flaming sword which turned every way" is not once spoken of, except in the third chapter of Genesis. Fancy this phenomenon at Eden's gate. When was it removed? When did Adam and his wife lose their desire to return? Had their descendants also no wish to enter? How can these questions be answered? A "flaming sword" is a most striking emblem of God's displeasure; just as the vermilion cavalry of Zechariah charging out of the myrtle woods by night, and "the fiery stream" of Daniel, are thrilling images of God's judgments, but to learn their design it is not imperative to take the statements *literatim*. God is as unapproachable to-day as He was six thousand years ago to wicked men. To them He is always a "flaming sword." "Our God," says the apostle, "is a consuming fire." He is also now, as then, and will ever be, "The Tree of Life," from which all access is barred save through Christ, who is the Way. If we take a bird's-eye view of Eden, its inhabitants, and phenomena, we must be struck with the combination of reality and symbol. Let us assign to each its proper place, observe the particular fitness of their mingled use, and extract a meaning from the whole in concord with each several part without a single jar.

Divers speculations have been formed touching the serpent, prior and subsequent to his supposed degradation. Some have conjectured a species not now to be found - extinct as the Dodo; others have fancied the beast had wings and feet. But all this is mere guess work. In spite of all these imaginary definitions and consequent imperfections, the organisation of the serpent is truly marvellous. "What zoology and anatomy," says Beard, "have unfolded of the nature of serpents, amounts to this: that their parts are as exquisitely adjusted to the form of their whole, and to their habits and sphere of life, as is the organisation of any animal which, in the terms of absolute comparison, we call superior to them. It is true that the serpent has no limbs; yet it can out-climb the monkey, out-swim the fish, out-leap the jerboa, and, suddenly loosing the coils of its crouching spiral, it can spring so high into the air, as to seize a bird upon the wing; thus all those creatures fall its prey. The serpent has neither hands nor claws: yet it can out-wrestle the athlete, and crush the tiger in the embraces of its overlapping folds. Far from licking up its food as it glides along, the serpent lifts up its crushed prey, and presents it grasped, as in a death coil, to the gaping mouth. It is truly wonderful to see the

work of hands, feet, and fins, performed by a mere modification of its vertebrate column.” Let us hear Professor Owen. “The long segments of the vertebrae of both the head and the trunk, although developed according to common vertebrae type, are modified for express ends and functions in the several vertebrate species, and in a greater degree, for example, in the serpent than in man. The squamous principle of suture, is here carried to an extreme. The cranial segments of the skull are sheathed one within the other, and the bone in each, being of greatest density and thickness, supplies a special provision against the dangers to which it would be subject, from falling bodies and the tread of heavy beasts. The whole organisation of the serpent is replete with such instances of design, in relation to the needs of their apodal (footless) vermiform character: just as the snake-like eel is compensated by analogous modifications among fishes, and the snake-like centipede among insects.” (Lecture on the Power of God, as manifested in His Animal Creation). The conclusion to be drawn from this is, not that the serpent is an accursed cripple in the animal kingdom, but that he is highly perfect and marvellously elaborate, in comparison with all the rest of the animals. We have therefore, no fact agreeing with the notion of cursing and degradation, while we have, as shown above, many facts to prove his organic superiority. Hence, we may infer that the Mosaic account is figurative, not literal.

These remarks will probably be sufficient to convey our ideas, and to start afresh some, who care for such matters, in the consideration of the Mosaic narrative.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST RE-CONSIDERED.

The process of learning and unlearning seems almost necessarily concurrent to the end of life. While we are collecting truths with one hand, we are throwing away errors with the other. It is well, when men have courage enough, to discard what they once thought to be true, as soon as they discover it to be false. The danger is that we may be too conservative, and, from fear of change and pride of comprehensive foresight, hold on to useless notions, which always clog the wheels of progress. On the other side mere love of novelty is very hazardous. There are undoubtedly certain landmarks and boundaries eternally fixed; these should be our guides. In all branches of truth they are few and simple when we find them.

This article is headed “the temptation of Christ re-considered,” because it is well known what view we ourselves have expressed heretofore of this remarkable transaction; and because the sequel will not agree therewith in some respects. Many of our readers are acquainted also with certain explanations given of the temptation of Christ in works which have been before the public for some years. One states that an angel was the person who urged Jesus to work miracles in His own favour. Another has affirmed, what always appeared to us fanciful enough, if not contrary to sound inference, namely, the probability that a Roman emperor was “the tempter.” Both these authorities, like ourselves, are as far as possible from the supposition that “the tempter” was the Devil of popular theology. This Devil is called the Accuser: but it will be seen that Christ’s “tempter” did not accuse anyone. He, or it, only tried to cause Christ to fall or to cross over the right line. This is the meaning of *diabolos*, or devil. This devil is also termed Satan, which simply signifies adversary. Though that which tempted Jesus was not an accuser, still it was unquestionably an adversary to Him.

We are now inclined to dismiss the idea that Christ’s tempter was outside Himself. We see no necessity to believe that there was either an angel, a Roman emperor, or any other person present, prompting the Son of God to sin against His Father; but let us by no means be thought to do away with the necessity for the temptation. We maintain that Christ was tempted in all points like unto us, that this was needful, in order to show that man can obey God, as well as to gain the victory over sin and ultimately destroy it; but what we have to speak of is the way in which this was accomplished. A true conclusion is not always reached by one path of search. Vessels steer from various points of the compass into the same harbour, and calculators arrive at identical results by different reckonings. A ship may sail round about without occasion, and an arithmetician may employ more figures than are requisite to work out a problem, but the end is uniform. So it seems with regard to the temptation of Jesus; we have traversed unnecessary waters, and made useless calculations to obtain a result which we might have arrived at by a shorter road, avoiding at the same time many obstacles, the explanation or removal of which is demanded of us, a demand not easy to satisfy.

The first record of the temptation is given by Matthew in chapter iv., verses 1 to 11. Mark has only two verses on the subject, 12 and 18 of chapter i. Luke in chapter iv. speaks of the temptation from the first to the thirteenth verse. John makes no allusion to the affair. The amount of testimony, therefore, is very small, nevertheless it is not without variation. A particular is mentioned by Luke, not noticed by Mark and

Matthew, and so forth. The best mode, we think, is to present the three narratives in their respective order, and carefully consider every word of each; by this plan we are sure to detect an obstacle, however small it may be, if such exist. This is similar to pounding a substance in a mortar; it must be cast out as unfit for use if the whole will not pulverize, as this furnishes proof that some foreign ingredient is present, or that we are vainly endeavouring to reduce to one consistence that which cannot be so treated.

The account of the Temptation given by Matthew, in chapter iv., is as follows: -

1. Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil.
2. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred.
3. And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.
4. But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.
5. Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple,
6. And saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.
7. Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.
8. Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them;
9. And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.
10. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.
11. Then the devil leaveth him, and behold, angels came and ministered unto him.

The Holy Spirit (Luke iv. 1) was the influence which led, or drove, Jesus away into the wilderness. "Led up," is the expression used by Matthew; that is, led up from the river Jordan, in which He had just been immersed by John. Jesus had, therefore, not far to go to reach the wilderness; He was in it, in fact, already; but was now to be carried farther up, away from the dwellings of men, to sojourn in those parts occupied by "wild beasts." Mark i. 13. It was the wilderness of Judea where the Son of God was put to the proof. The country extends along the Jordan, and the Dead Sea to the east of Jerusalem. The meaning of our word wilderness is not exactly that of the original, which denotes a mountainous, rough, and thinly settled country, but not altogether destitute of inhabitants; emphatically, "a desert place apart;" no food, only the stones of the wilderness. Jesus was here forty days and forty nights, like Moses in the Mount. In both instances a miracle was performed by God, for the human body could not survive a fifth part of that time without sustenance. The Father, it should seem, kept His Son alive, enduring all the time the cravings of hunger. In the Divine judgment it was needful to protract the trial. Let it be remembered that Jesus was full of the Holy Spirit, that is, able to perform anything He might choose. The question now arises: Who, or what, was the tempter, or trier of His fidelity? "Orthodoxy" answers, the devil, the prince of the fallen angels. To discuss this reply is not our present intention;* suffice it to say, that the very existence of such a monster appears to be an insufferable blot on Omnipotence.

Human nature, which was the nature of Jesus, has two sides. Man is a dual being, composed of sentiments and propensities; but none of these are bad; although there is not one that may not lead to sin. They may be compared to so many lines, diverging from a centre to a circumference. Whenever any one of those lines crosses the outer circle, transgression has taken place. The sentiment of devotion exercising itself within the prescribed radius is true worship; if it overstep the line, it becomes idolatry. Love, the strongest passion of the heart, is pure and honourable within the given circle; beyond, it is fornication and adultery. If, then, that which has the greatest power to cause the commission of crime in its most abhorrent shape, is clean, holy, and good, within certain limits, it is not needful to apply the argument in detail to all the less powerful passions. We will content ourselves at present by saying, that whoever preaches the doctrine that the desires of man's nature are inherently bad makes the Creator the author of all sin.

* *Those who are curious to see a full examination of the subject may read Diabolism.*

But to return to Jesus famishing in the wilderness. Why should we bring in a second person, called the devil, whether man or angel? Diabolos, as we have said, means that causing to cross over, from *dia* through, or over, and *ballo* to throw or cause to pass. Now, suppose Jesus had made the stones into bread, what would have been the true reason of that action? Would it not be the hunger gnawing at his vitals? Unquestionably so. Would this cause have been sufficient of itself to induce the miracle? Quite sufficient; for without intense hunger there had been no thought of providing Himself with food. It has been well said by Newton, that when one sufficient cause has been found to account for an effect, no other should be sought for. Who, in the trial of Christ, will contend that hunger, biting for forty days and forty nights, was not cause enough to tempt Him who had the power to change stones into bread and eat thereof? And if this is an all-sufficient cause, why should we seek for another?

But it will be asked, could hunger be called diabolos? We answer in the affirmative, for the reason before given, viz., that it was hunger that might have thrown, or caused Jesus to pass over the line. Was hunger wicked? If so, then God created wickedness. Is that wicked which may lead to wickedness? Then it were wicked to be hungry. The apostle Paul sometimes used the word sin when he speaks of natural desires; this is convenient, because those desires do lead to sin when they are not restrained. This is the only sense in which sin can be said to dwell in us. It is what is called metonymy, or the putting of one thing for another, as “this bread is my body;” that is, stands for, or represents my body. “This cup is the new testament in my blood;” that is, the wine in this cup represents my blood. No mode of expression is more common in any language. The most homely illustration, perhaps, is found in the saying, “the kettle boils;” the water is understood. As the bread stands for the body, the wine for the blood, and the kettle for the water, so sin stands for the desires; but it no more follows that the desires are really sin than that the bread is really the body, the wine really the blood, or the kettle really the water.

No matter what is the cause of our passing over, or transgressing, a command of God, that is diabolos or devil; and “the devil” which tried Christ was hunger. Now, let the account of this great trial be read in this light, and we do not think it will sound at all strange. We shall certainly avoid some difficulties, for, to construe it in a rigid literal sense, the Holy Spirit seems to be co-operating with the Prince of Darkness to the eternal peril of His well-beloved Son; nor is this more than modified, if we suppose some less powerful personage to be the tempter. As for a “Roman Emperor,” we should find it hard to admit the idea that one contemporary with Christ was so intelligent in the Jewish Scriptures as the questioner of Jesus; besides, there are other strong objections. The trial would take this natural shape in the Lord’s mind. In the lonely, foodless wilderness, hunger visits Him, and urges thus: “If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.” The starving man reflects, looks wistfully, and at length, He speaks: I am God’s Son, and I have power to make the stones into bread; but, why did my Father bring me into this desert place, where there is no meat? Was it not to try me? If I yield to hunger shall I not commit sin? Yes - “It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” Though hungry as the grave my Father can sustain me; He has given me great powers, and I can use them; but no, to obey and perish rather than disobey and live, is my resolve. At this crisis the trial is removed, but only to recur in another form, for men are weaker at some points than others. But before we proceed to notice the next attempt, let us observe the beautiful lesson taught by this trial - implicit reliance on God; full confidence, like that of a little child in its father’s word, - “My Father said it, and He will do it.” Here is the very essence of Godliness - to love and trust our Heavenly Father. Ah, this is simple, indeed, but grander far than any creed or philosophy!

A fresh scene opens. We have a view of “the holy city,” Jerusalem. We look towards the Temple, and raising our eyes, behold Jesus standing on the top of the highest porch, which is called “Solomon’s.” The Temple was surrounded with porches fifty-five feet broad and seventy-five high. The porch on the south side was sixty-seven feet broad and one hundred and fifty high. From the top of this to the bottom of the valley below was more than seven hundred feet, and Josephus remarked that one could scarcely look down without dizziness.” Matthew says, “the devil taketh him up into the holy city and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple.” Popular notions would fancy the Son of God carried through the air, and perched bird-like on some giddy point, the Devil, invisible to men, standing at his side suggesting self-destruction, in pious phrase. But Reason has no need of such help to interpret the account; she prefers to be left to the record and herself to find, in accordance with human experience, a solution of the matter. Having therefore dismissed the obtrusive “Gentleman in black,” and all others of whatever rank, or hue, she stands to meditate upon the scene. The term “taketh him up” signifies in the original to accompany, not to compel. Yonder walks the

Son of God, buried in intense thought, incited by wild ambition; He paces and turns, turns and paces; looks over the parapet into the terrible abyss, so deep that the light fades into chilling shadow. Ambition now whispers, "Cast thyself down; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." To perform this feat of leaping from the pinnacle or porch, and swooping like an eagle across the deep valley, in the sight of all the city, was exactly the kind of imagination that would spring from the possession of power to do it unhurt. "But wherefore," to Himself said Jesus, "should I do this thing?" The passage indeed is written of me; but to leap hence were to tempt my Father; to uselessly provoke Him to shield me from harm, to feed the pride of display, and to work no good thing. My answer therefore is from the same scripture, "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Thus Jesus again overcomes His natural inclination, and is strengthened thereby. The diabolos or devil, in this instance, was love of grand display, which, if followed would have occasioned Him to fall in a literal as well as in a spiritual sense.

The next scene is enacted on "an exceeding high mountain;" but we do not know what mountain this was. There is no difficulty, however, in supposing Jesus to be in such a situation. He loved seclusion and solitude; with a vast poetic mind, He oft retired to weep and pray for men, more particularly for the loved city of which He was born King. It might well be, that while thus apart, He stood on some lofty mountain top, which commanded a spacious view; like Moses of old, on the summit of Nebo, scanning with eager eye "the land of far distances." Such a position, too, would give wings to the mind; more fleet than the lightning, His fancy would encircle the world of which He was also born Sovereign. Could He not truly say, "I am monarch of all I survey." A small extension of that wonderful and mysterious force which He possessed, would have banished the Jewish Sanhedrin, and kept even the legions of Caesar at bay. Would not these reflections evoke a keen desire for immediate universal empire? And to succumb to this wish, may aptly enough be described as doing homage. Temporal glory was the diabolos or devil in this new scene. To gratify this was indeed to be "master of the situation," but what would follow? That whichever follows pride, namely, abasement. Jesus perceiving this desire to be adverse to His Father's will, exclaimed at once, "Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." Thus nobly with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, He vanquished the lust of power. To this passion, it has been said of some that they were slaves. Alexander wept, so we are told, because there was not another world to conquer. Some fall down and idolise gold, believing that it can procure them all they covet. In the present picture. Power is the diabolos or tempter, and in the case of Jesus it must have been very strong.

This then brings us to the end of Matthew's account of the temptation of Christ, and it is for the reader to judge for himself of the reasonableness of the interpretation given. He will at all events observe how well it agrees with the language of the apostle James. "Let no man (and Jesus was a man), say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God . . . every man (does not this include Jesus?) every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust," or desire. We think this one statement will, on reflection, be found sufficiently inclusive and exclusive; it includes every real cause of wrong-doing and excludes the need of any personal devil, whether man or angel. Having done with Matthew's account, we will turn to those of Mark and Luke, but they will not detain us long. Mark writes as follows: -

"And immediately the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness. And he was there in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts, and the angels ministered unto him." i. 12-13.

Matthew notices the angels, but says nothing about the wild beasts. Those angels, or messengers ministered unto Jesus, that is, supplied His wants; but who they were we know not.

Luke speaks of the devil shewing Jesus "all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time." Literality is not intended here. What but thought, which outstrips the lightning's flash, could bring this picture to the eye? But thought could present it, for whether to Sirius, or the farthest star, distance to thought is annihilated, it flies to and fro baffling all measurement of its speed; and such thought would spring up in the contemplative situation assigned to Christ, "an exceeding high mountain."

The last thing calling for remark in Luke's narrative, is the ending of the temptation and the departure of the devil for a season. How shall we harmonize the departure of the devil with our present interpretation? James will, we think, effect this. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." iv. 7. Is a person alluded to

here? By no means. James had said before that lust, or desire, is the tempter. Resist lust, or desire, therefore, and it will flee from you, though not altogether; only for “a season.” So it was with “the man Christ Jesus,” for after these special trials He must have felt others also. Desire then, or that causing to fall, may very fitly be styled the diabolos, which being resisted departs only to return with every fresh circumstance to arouse it. Here we leave the subject, having advanced enough to be understood; but let it not be supposed that we have anathemas in store for those who look at the matter in another aspect. The object unquestionably is the same, namely, trial in order to perfection of faith, and for an example to us who strive to become sons of God harmless or sincere, blameless or holy, and therefore without rebuke.

CHAPTER XI.

The Son of God before and after his anointing - The enmity slain.

It has been alleged that the word *christos* signifies anointing spirit as well as a person anointed, therefore the Christ existed as a person distinct from the Father before Jesus was born, and in the conception of Jesus the anointing spirit, or *christos*, became the anointed One.

Let us take the statement about the import of the word *christos* first. It is said to denote both anointing and anointed; but there is no authority for this double meaning. The most part of our readers will understand the matter better by a simple illustration. Anointing is the act of pouring oil upon; it is therefore a process, or a doing of something. Anointed is the act finished, and signifies that some person or thing has had oil poured on him or it. This person or thing is then called the anointed; that is, the person or thing which has been poured upon. The word anointed therefore defines a certain person or thing, but the word anointing denotes the act of pouring, or that which is used, as the anointing oil. But if we say that *christos*, or anointed, means also the anointing (spirit), then we make out that the oil for anointing and the object anointed therewith are the same; which is to make out what is not true, but what is absurd.

Now, the term *christos* is a Greek word, and its meaning is anointed. If a is prefixed it signifies an anointed one; if the is prefixed then it designates the anointed one, that is, some particular anointed one. When *christos* is joined to the name Jesus, it shews that Jesus was an anointed one; but when, as is the case in Scripture, the is put before it, then it defines that Jesus is the anointed one distinct from all others.

Inasmuch as no person can be styled an anointed one before his anointing has taken place, it follows that it would be incorrect thus to describe any one before that event, and the question to which that gives rise is this, When was Jesus anointed, or when did Jesus become the Christ? which is the same thing.

Herod enquired where the Christ should be born; but that comprises no more than where shall He be born, who is to be the Christ, or who is to be the anointed? In the same way it may be asked, where should the King of the Jews be born? Jesus is said to be born King of the Jews, but as a matter of fact. He is not King of the Jews yet, after the lapse of nearly two thousand years. When He takes His seat on the throne of His father David, and reigns over the house of Israel, then, and not till then, will He be in reality the King of the Jews. This is exactly the case with regard to His anointing. Peter says, “He was made both Lord and Christ;” but it is impossible that He could be Christ before He was made so equally impossible is it that He was so before He was anointed. Jesus was born the Christ elect; He was born the King elect of the Jews and of the Gentiles; but He was neither born the Christ in fact, nor the King in fact, unless we can prove that He was anointed as soon as He was born, and that as soon as He was born He was reigning as a King. A man nominated for member of Parliament, when the election is over, and he has a majority of votes, is not there and then actually a member of Parliament. He is a member elect, but not until he has entered the House and taken the oaths and his seat, is he a member in reality.

Jesus bears three titles - prophet, priest, and king. To these we may add a fourth, a sacrifice. Was He born a prophet; born a sacrifice; born a priest? No. Yet He was born each of these elect. He has become three of “them in fact, namely, prophet, sacrifice, and priest, but not the fourth, for He is not yet a King. We now repeat the question: When was the Son of God anointed? If we answer at birth, where is the proof?

Look a moment at Jesus as a Saviour. Was He born a Saviour, that is, was He a Saviour the moment He was born? His parents were commanded to name Him Jesus, "for He shall save His people from their sins." He was then born to be a Saviour.

The Testimony concerning His anointing is on this wise. After John had baptized Jesus, "one of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, we have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ." What was it that this one heard John speak? "And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him, and I knew him not: but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Spirit. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." At this time then, according to John, the Son of God was anointed, or "made Christ." The Spirit which John saw descending rested upon Him, and was the power of all His miracles. It remained with Him until He was crucified; it returned to Him at His resurrection, and transformed His corruptible into an incorruptible body.

Again, "For of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, were gathered together." Acts iv. 27. "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit, and with power;" x. 38. This is declared in the previous verse to be "after the baptism which John preached," so that the anointing of "the holy child" does not mean that Jesus was a child when He was anointed; and the text also shews that He did not require to be made holy by baptism, for as a child He was holy, whereas at baptism, "He began to be about 80 years old." This wonderful anointing was not to purify or cleanse, but to invest Him with almost boundless power. Before His anointing He had wrought no mighty work. The first display was on the third day after He was baptized, at the marriage feast at Cana of Galilee, where He turned about 18 firkins of water into good wine. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His glory; and His disciples believed on Him."

Having proved that Jesus was not anointed before John baptized Him, we will anticipate an objection in this shape. If Jesus was not Christ before He was baptized, what difference was there between Him and John, or any other man? Does not this idea somewhat lower Jesus? We answer there was a mighty difference, neither is Jesus degraded at all.

Jesus was the Son of God, not merely a son, for He was the only begotten; John was the son of Zecharias. John possessed the Spirit, yet he "did no miracle." The prophets wrought many miracles; they had Spirit powers; but what were they? Simply sons of men; slaves set in high authority. Their deeds had no redeeming force, nor could have, had they been ever so much greater. Their works terminated with themselves; they had no power over death. Thus it was, and must be, with every servant; not so with the well beloved Son.

The Father educated the Son, and cherished Him. At an early age the child knew that He was "about His Father's business." But in all this there was no entrance into public life, no anointing for mighty acts. This was the school of probation for the after exalted official dignity. Jesus was the free born intended for the work of deliverance; prepared under Divine tuition for the ensuing scheme. He was the reality of the typical priest when clothed. Aaron as a private personage could not enter the holy, address Israel, receive offerings, &c. All this appertained to him as high priest, enrobed in garments of holiness and beauty. What he was thus adorned, Jesus became in Himself. The Jews could see Aaron's robes, but they could not see the Spirit vestments enwrapping the Son of God. His deeds amazed and vexed them, but His aspect had nothing new or strange. Here was the enigma. Unable to trace His utterances and His works to the predictions of their prophets, and through them to the Eternal God, they beheld Him and spoke of Him as an ordinary man. Hence their opposition, and their questions, intelligible enough from their point of view. Thou art not fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? He replied, I am before Abraham. Now identified with the Father; now one with Him; now no longer speaking of Himself; now thinking it no robbery to be equal with God, because the wondrous gifts had been bestowed not usurped. He said, I and my Father are one. I came down from Heaven. I am from above, ye are from beneath.

While enjoying all this. He was truly rich, not to allude to His future wealth, but in temporals poor, without where to sleep. He must now consent to be stripped of His honour and emoluments. Once the mortal crowd fell back; once He glided through the savage mob and went His way. Now He must lay down His

strength, consent to be shorn of the locks of power, led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb. Voluntarily He becomes again the plain man Jesus of Nazareth, though begotten Son of God. Once He was a helpless babe carried off in hasty flight by father and mother to escape the devouring sword; now He must consent to be cut off, give Himself a victim for others.

This done, He lay still in death, the dread silence of the tomb was not broken for three days. The poverty of the grave devoured Him. All this was for sinners! Early in the morning, before the sun had lit the sky with amber rays, while it was cold and "yet dark," seraphic fire shone upon the rocky cave, the ponderous gate of stone moved lightly to omnipotence, and the murdered Son of God awoke to an eternal morning. He rose up painless and refreshed from three days' dreamless sleep; emerged from the sepulchre, left His angelic guards to answer the tearful women; walked leisurely in the garden of the kind rich man, and was mistaken for the gardener. What had He left behind! What was there not before! Who can word the thoughts and feelings of that first resurrection hour!

THE ENMITY SLAIN.

The words which form the foundation of this article are written in Ephesians ii. 15, 16: - "Having abolished in His flesh the enmity - having slain the enmity." That which Paul calls "the enmity," he, in the same place, explains to signify the law of Moses, "even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Here is a somewhat singular title for a great and wise law, - "the enmity." This word generally stands for a bad feeling, and as such is strongly denounced by the apostles. Paul styled the law "the enmity" because it was the apparent occasion of enmity between Jews and Gentiles, not because there was anything really prejudicial in the law itself. No, "the law was holy, just, and good." This employment of one term for another, of a bad name, so to speak, for a good thing, - because that good thing misused brings about what is bad, is similar to Paul's use of the word "sin" when he means the desires "that lead to sin."

It will be observed also that Paul speaks as though "the enmity" were in Christ's flesh, for he says, "having abolished in His flesh the enmity." But enmity in a literal sense, especially that which existed between Jews and Gentiles in consequence of "the law," had no place in the flesh of Jesus. But how, some will ask, could that be abolished in His flesh, which was not in it? As they also ask, How could sin be condemned in the flesh, if there were no sin there? A little reflection on the expressions will produce an appropriate answer. The text like many more, needs some other words to be understood. For example, to preach the Kingdom of God means to preach the gospel of the Kingdom of God; where to complete the sense it is necessary to understand the phrase "the gospel of" to be intended. Even so in this case. "Having abolished in or by the slaying of His flesh the enmity;" in other words, having fulfilled the law in all its requirements and taken it out of the way by nailing it to the cross, so that it may no longer be the cause of enmity between the two peoples.

The slaying of the enmity had for its object the making "in Himself," i.e., Christ, "of twain," or of two branches of "the old man," "one new man, so making peace." This opens up to mankind a vast and glorious prospect; it declares the purpose of God through His Son to restore them into one family; to destroy all "enmity;" to establish "on earth peace and goodwill among men." To this end the Son of God suffered shame, spitting, murder, and was afterwards raised from the dead. It was as though all the malice and fury of human hearts were poured out upon His head, as though He consented to bear in His own body all the anguish of a wrangling, vengeful, sorrow-stricken world, on the condition that having "borne their griefs and carried their sorrows," they would give each other "the kiss of peace;" be "no longer twain," but "one new man," renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.

The slaying of the enmity and the breaking down of the middle wall of partition were the results of one and the same great act - the voluntary death of "the just for the unjust." The design of the Deity was not then, nor is it now, really completed; but that which confirmed the promise of it was achieved. The Jew still stands aloof from the Gentile; he is as much apart as when "the middle wall" separated him from the Gentile in the temple of Jerusalem. He has yet to learn that some of the "heathen" have been grafted into the Israelitish olive tree, and he will be astonished to find that they stand equal in rank with the stars of his nation; he has yet to be taught that "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him." Acts x. 84, 85. And is not the Gentile also ignorant; is he not a stranger from the covenants of promise; an alien from the commonwealth of Israel; "without Christ, without hope, and without God in the world?" This is, in a universal sense, beyond confutation. The current

popular theology has no more relation to a future Israelitish government, with Jesus for its Prince, than had pagan idolatry, except in the matter of using Jesus' name. The hope of the one was almost identical with the hope of the other; - disembodied existence in perpetual delight, on some distant, unknown sphere! The anticipated occupation of pious pagans was very like that of millions of "good Christians," as vague as it could possibly be; supposed to consist in "gazing, sitting, and singing themselves away;" "losing themselves in Heaven above." And all this ethereal, flimsy, spiritual gauze has more charms for the deluded multitude, than the prospect of ruling their fellow-creatures, - of which indisputably they have much need - they themselves being made immortal and tangible, like Christ when seen and handled after rising from the grave. What amazing folly! Had not the prophets and apostles so plainly foretold the infatuation it were past belief!

CHAPTER XII.

"THE SON OF PERDITION."

THE SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

The "Son of Perdition" is the title chosen by the eternal Spirit, and put into the mouth of the apostle Paul, to denote a certain "man," whose characteristics are presented in the following summary: -

1. The man of sin. 2 Thes. ii. 8.
2. He opposeth and exalteth himself above all, being called a god, or an object of veneration.
3. He sits in the temple of the god, demonstrating that he is a god.
4. The lawless one.
5. With all power and signs and lying wonders.
6. With all deceit of injustice.

Equally plain and striking is the remarkable delineation of the features of this official man. If such an official personage has ever appeared in this mundane kosmos of ours, the foregoing "hue and cry" is surely precise enough to enable any one of ordinary powers of observation and comparison to identify him with unerring accuracy.

But other prophets were favoured with a glimpse of the same man, and in the Scriptures of Truth have "noted" what they beheld. Daniel recorded the subsequent items. He described:-

1. A little horn having eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking very great things.
2. I beheld, then, because of the great words which the horn spake.
3. His looks was more stout than his fellows.
4. The same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them.
5. Before this horn three of ten horns were plucked up by the roots.
6. He shall be diverse from the first horns.

The student will mark the close resemblance between the sketches given by Daniel and Paul; by the former, five hundred years before the latter wrote on the theme of this wonderful man to his watchful brethren in the city of Thessalonica. It seems to be the pleasure of the Eternal Spirit to develop His mind more fully upon a subject as time advances; hence, we may observe that the same lines in the portraiture by Paul are sharper and clearer than those traced by Daniel in his penograph. The symbolic "horn" of Daniel "dissolves," as it were, and re-appears in "the man" seen by Paul. The "stout look" of the interloper mentioned by Daniel comes out fully in the self-exalted god of the Pauline vision; the diversity from the companion horns discerned by Daniel is disclosed in the lawless peculiarity of the god-man depicted by the apostle, and so forth.

A very brief consideration of the "horns" will suggest that "the little horn" could not be intended to represent one individual, for the horns - namely, the ten - are explained to Daniel by the angel interpreter to signify kingdoms. This is evident, from a comparison of the vision of the image with the vision of the four beasts. Chap. ii. 39, 40, and chap. vii. This being the case, "the man of sin" must be a figure denoting a class

of official agents pertaining to the same system, which is made plain by the circumstance of “the man,” or “little horn,” being contemporary with, and lifted up above, the ten horns, even exacting the obeisance of them all. Analogical proof is also found in the fact that the Man Christ (Jesus) is not one person, but many in one, in which the man anti-Christ agrees. There is also a singular compactness in the affairs and elements of the latter, running parallel with the oneness and unity demanded of the constituents of the former.

Certain Papist writers have held that the Arabian prophet was the man of sin, probably because from their stand-point no other phenomenon having any likeness to the description could be perceived between themselves and the political horizon. The identity, however, of the Mahometan system with Paul’s “Son of Perdition” is effaced the moment we come to the details of the figure. It cannot be maintained that the leaders of Islamism placed themselves above the laws of their empire; it rather appears that they were on the whole, as scrupulous in keeping the laws as anxious to enforce their obedience. It was not at all incident to their constitution to exhibit themselves as gods, nor to claim that kind of adoration usually paid to the Divine Being. There is nothing in Saracen annals like a special and continued “war with the saints,” unless it be admitted that the saints are the worshippers of the beast in whose vitals “the sword of God” so deeply fleshed itself. Failure in these primary points being manifest, we need not multiply negative evidence, beyond the remark that “the Son of Perdition” was to be reserved for capture and destruction by the Sun of Righteousness, by whose fiery rays he will be consumed at His ascent from the East; whereas that order of things which issued from the Arabian pit has long since been abolished. The locusts rose up out of the smoke, and in the smoke they have been lost for ever.

There has been no institution in all the Eastern Hemisphere answering to the prophetic photograph of “the man of sin.” This “man,” or horn,” started up among “the horns” of Western Europe, audaciously shouting “surrender!” The prophetic-historic tide rolls from East to West, and the political navigator finds himself tossed amid the billows of “the great sea,” lashed into a fury astoundingly prolific of political “mire and dirt.” This is the habitat of the eleven amphibious monsters of the Hebrew prophetic bards. Nothing has escaped the “teeth” and “claws” of these savage “beasts.” They have preyed upon each other, and all of them upon “the flock of God.” The student will not fail to recognise, sometimes prowling craftily, at others loudly roaring above the rest, that singular brute which so much attracted the eye of the ancient seer as he “considered the horns.”

“The man” before us consists, up to the present time, if we are to accept his own account of himself, of two hundred and fifty-nine Popes, from the apostle Peter to Pius IX, who was elected out of five cardinals on June 11th, 1846, and crowned on the 21st of the same month. His family name is John Maria Mastai Ferretti: he was born at Sinigaglia, in the Legation of Urbino and Persaro, on the 13th May, 1792, and will consequently be 83 years old if he live till the 13th of May next. The French Revolution of 1848 made the Pope very unpopular, and he was obliged to leave Rome. He remained at Gaeta and Portici, in the Neapolitan territory, about a year and a half. Only a few days ago the Pope, speaking upon the present situation of the Holy See, said that the troubles of his house dated from 1848. There is no doubt of it. A new spirit was then let loose among the peoples of the West utterly irreconcilable with the policy of “the Man of Sin;” it was a spirit inaugurating the very “perdition” of which the Eternal Spirit, 1800 years before, had declared him to be “the son.” The workings of this spirit ought to be of profound interest to every disciple of Christ, for each is, even now, a constituent of the wondrous “Name,” and soon, in a new and astonishing phase, will be a visible element of the other Son, who will consummate the irremediable “perdition” already begun. It is the spirit of Republicanism, of the Commune, of the International, of Fenianism, and its vibrations are strongly felt in the present struggle between capital and labour; in a word, it is that spirit of unrest which will shake the ancient foundations of Nimrodian society, and hurl all their superstructures into the abyss of oblivion.

“The Man of Sin” is specially obnoxious to its attacks. He means eternity of depotism; it proclaims radical change. Such a spirit, emanating whence none can tell, flowing and circulating with an incomprehensible subtlety, uncontrollable as the air we breathe, seems to be an unrevealed item of the Divine plan indispensable to the disruption of human government: it distils upon all peoples, but particularly upon those of the prophetic “earth” with an occult miasmatic power. It is volcanic, disintegrating, and dissolving in its action; stratifying, as it were, the vast overgrown fauna and flora of a steamy carboniferous age, utilizing, or rather preparing, almost exhaustless magazines of solid wealth for the calm enjoyment of a golden and protracted aeon.

But ere it has devastated “the house of the wicked,” demolishing “the wood, hay, and stubble,” and purifying what there may be of “silver and gold,” let us glance at the historic counterpart of some of the lineaments of “the Son of Perdition.” His present features indicate extreme age; dotage is indelibly chiselled upon that once terrible countenance; memory fitfully recalls the days of youth and vigour, and the attenuated and decrepit “man” displays a transient peevishness at the prospect of dire fate looming in the not far distant horizon; then, like a murderer, lapses into a stupor of resignation, awaiting the hour of doom.

There is a time for all things, and we may rejoice that we are living witnesses of the declining age of this MONSTER MAN. He is powerless to harm those who stand and mock him to his face. Few, comparatively, are willing to do his cruel bidding, and those who are dare not. He is a grey, clawless, toothless, old lion, muzzled; pitiable enough but for the remembrance of his former habits of ravening among the helpless flock. He is, as we sometimes say, but “the shadow of his former self.” It will be understood that we are speaking of the collective, not the individual “man.”

In middle life his mien was “dreadful and terrible,” and his voice like the roll of thunder. On the 25th of March, in the year 1514, one Tristano Cugna was sent as ambassador from the King of Portugal to the Court of Leo X., the then reigning Pontifex Maximus. The envoy had with him rich presents of wild animals, brought by the Portuguese from the far Indies, and among them a tolerably well-trained elephant, for on approaching Leo the creature stopped and bowed himself three times. This was regarded by the lookers-on as a sign that the Divine supremacy of the Pope was instinctively felt even among the beasts of the forest. But the reader will be more struck with the address of the ambassador than the submissive performance of the elephant. At the sight of Leo, the general exclaimed, “Fear and trembling have come over me, and a horrible darkness;” whereupon the Pope signified by his gracious manner that the envoy was received with favour. The latter then ventured to add, “That Divine countenance, which, shining as the sun, has dispersed the mists of my mind.” He then proceeded to narrate to Leo the splendid conquests in the East, and acknowledging him as the Supreme Lord, ascribed to him all the glory thereof, considering the work as a fulfilment of prophecy, “Thou shalt rule from sea to sea and from the river (Tiber at Rome) to the world’s end; the kings of Arabia and Saba shall bring gifts to thee; yea, all princes shall worship thee; “and under thee there shall be one fold and one shepherd.” In this scene the reader is presented with a clear fulfilment of Paul’s prediction, “He exalteth himself above all, being called a god, or an object of veneration.”

On the occasion of the coronation of Henry VI., Baronius the Papal historian, writes, “But our Lord the Pope sate in the Pontifical chair, holding the imperial crown between his feet, and the Emperor, bending his head, received the crown, and the Empress, in the same manner, from the feet of our Lord the Pope. But our Lord the Pope instantly struck with his foot the Emperor’s crown, and cast it upon the ground, signifying that he had the power of deposing him from the Empire if he were undeserving of it. The Cardinals, however, lifted up the crown, and placed it on the Emperor’s head.” This was Pope Celestine III., who was elected in his 85th year, A.D., 1191, and died at the age of 92, on January 8th, 1198.

Boniface XIII., in excommunicating Philip, king of France, informed him that “He was set as prince over all nations, to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to build.” This was A.D. 1294.

But we obtain, perhaps, the best idea of the vast authority assumed by “the Man of Sin” from a decree of Hildebrand, which Gregory VII. issued against Henry IV of Germany, when he excommunicated him the second time. Henry had crossed the Alps into Italy, in the depth of winter, to beg the Pope’s forgiveness. The Pope was then spending his time with the Countess Matilda, at the Castle of Canusium. Henry informed him of his approach, but the Pope treated him most barbarously, compelling him to stand barefoot three whole days, fasting from morning till night, in the month of January, with very little clothing, except a coarse woollen tunic.

As to the plucking up by the roots of the three horns, the only feature, perhaps, remaining to be spoken of, there are several threes set down by expositors; so that there is no scarcity of facts resembling the prediction; the question for decision seems rather one of selection. Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and many others, understood the three horns to stand for the Lombard power, the Greek Exarchate, and the Dukedom of Rome, under the Exarchate. Brooks thought that “the three horns plucked up are with tolerable unanimity declared to be Rome, Lombardy, and Ravenna, which formed the Papal territories for more than a

thousand years.” Peyrani, the Vaudois minister, marked the Herulian, Ostrogoths, and Lombards as the three. But, without entering here into the various arguments in support of different threes, the three which, to our mind, appear best sustained are the Vandals, the Ostrogoths, and Lombards. In 583, the Vandal horn in Africa, Corsica, and Sardinia, as well as the Ostrogoth horn, in Italy, was “plucked up by the roots,” by the strength of Justinian’s general, Belisarius. The Vandals were Arians, and consequently very hateful to the Pope. At this epoch the Longobards, or Lombards, were far away in Pannonia, but about 40 years later they conquered Lombardy, and extended their conquests to the neighbourhood of Rome itself. They grew rapidly, and during the eighth century became so formidable that the Popes Stephen II. and Adrian I. appealed to the Franks for assistance. This appeal was responded to by Pepin and Charlemagne, whose force “plucked up” this third horn also, never to take root any more among the Powers. The Man of Sin-power was now predominant, lord temporal and spiritual. The temporal power has departed, perhaps never to return, but that long career of spiritual domination which is marvellously strong, has yet some considerable time to run before the predicted “perdition” is consummated. If Daniel’s time, times, and a half be lunar, something short of two ordinary life times will suffice to fulfil the prophecy; and, as far as conjecture is worth anything, it would seem that such a period would allow of several great political changes among Jews and Gentiles, corresponding with the requirements of the prophetic word. Another generation, then, may be laid in the dust; the next may be living at the rising of the Sun of Righteousness. To those who sleep the event is always at the door, and to those who wake it approaches stealthily; may we not, even now, liken it to the points of the tall masts rising, as it were, out of the sea, and nearing as they rise. Let us be always ready.

THE SUN OR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

“But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall.” Malachi iv. 2.

Our last thoughts were running upon “the Son of Perdition.” The evidence adduced for his identification showed that he was not one person, but many; each successively the chief of a gigantic system of spiritual and political fraud; the very god-head of black deceit clothed in the snow-white raiment of purity and peace. We now turn to a pleasanter theme. The Sun of Righteousness rises on the scene. The prophets of old have heralded His approach, and sung beforehand His universal praise. The celestial hosts wonder and admire. They fill His train to earth, and glory in His warming healing power among the wrongs and woes of mortal men. The trumpet’s blast proclaims from the mountains and the little hills, peace by righteousness! (Ps. lxxii. 3). The slave casts down “his broken chain, the tyrant lord his crown, the conqueror his wreath, the priest his book,” to list “the mighty breath” from the lips of Him who is the truth, scattering all “human mockeries,” and speaking rest to a way-worn world. His presence unlocks every secret, dissolves every doubt; false science and matter-deifying wisdom cower in shame and dread; the people are now near to God, they see His form and hear His voice. With this in view, each rapid hour seems long. We have faith, but our utterance is feeble. We wish for Emanuel’s presence to silence the “scoffers,” and could die satisfied to know His Advent “no longer is delayed.” How much hangs on this event! History, prophecy, Christianity! The whole history of man, past, present, and future, went down into the rich man’s grave in the olive garden at the foot of Mount Olivet. The word of truth declares He rose and lived again; we therefore say to our soul, “Peace be still!” and wait in patience till we see Him for ourself and not another.

Till He come let us remember Him. Let us think of all the glad things recorded in ancient times; the songs and the visions of our rising Day-star, and feel, as poet and prophet felt of old, as with “fire shut up in our bones,” enrapt, and “our mouth filled with laughter, and our tongue with singing.” Yonder He stands, “binding His foal to the vine, and His ass’s colt unto the choice vine; He washed His garments in wine, and His clothes in the blood of grapes, His eyes are red with wine, and His teeth white with milk.” He sits as the “lawgiver;” and “unto Him shall the gathering of the people be.” “The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth, and he shall give strength unto His king, and exalt the horn of His anointed.” “He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him.”

The sun is the grandest figure in universal nature. From him the moon borrows her pale soft light; the stars fade at his presence; the ice and snow vanish before his beams -” his going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.” We may call him the heart of the universe. The Papal sun has scorched and withered the world of spiritual thought for more

than a thousand years, and scathes it still. We wait the Sun of Righteousness, with healing in His rays, to chase away the night, to resuscitate the world's mind, to cause truth to spring out of the earth, and righteousness to look down from heaven. This is the True Light. For fifteen centuries and more it has been hidden from men. The expected speedy return of the Lord was not realised. The heart grew sick, hope declined, and aspirations, wrong only as to time, gradually gave place to the unpromised, and the unreal. Vain man imagined and sought a distant rest, spurning this proffered sublunary home, coupled with the deathlessness of his real bodily self; and now, like a rudderless ship, without chart or compass, he knows not where he stands nor whither he is tending on this restless ocean of mortal existence. It requires that He who walked upon the sea should step on board this frail and wildered bark, and repeat the tranquillizing words, "Peace, be still."

We understand this long absence: it is needful: it is a time of solemn preparation. The brethren of the lost Joseph must be moved to wonder and desire by new and providential circumstances, as a necessary prelude to His appearance in their midst. "A little while," and He shall be known to them. The twelve stars of Israel shall yet make their obeisance before Him; then will there be weeping and joy - a mournful retracing of all the chequered past, and a fresh irradiation of the many gracious promises of their covenant-keeping God. But this great work is small by comparison, for the prophet saith, "It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE OLD MILLENIUM - THE OLD NAME.

From the day that Moses stood before the burning bush on "The mountain of God" to that day on which Nebuchadnezzar put out the eyes of Zedekiah was nine hundred and forty-three years, if the generally received chronology be correct. The period is so near upon a thousand years that we have styled it a millenium. Jeshurun was toiling in "hard bondage" in the heavy clay on the banks of the Nile, and over him stood the rigorous "taskmaster" with his stick, urging the completion of the appointed "tale." Moses, away in the desert, stood trembling with wonder, "afraid to look upon God," yet anxious to see why "the bush was not consumed."

Such were the elements out of which was elaborated the most splendid kingdom under the whole heaven. And of this kingdom we can say what cannot be said of any other, - it was a great prophecy as well as a grand historical fact. Moses found it as difficult to consolidate this human clay into a political constitution as the Israelites did to mould the natural clay of Egypt into bricks, which clay often required a mixture of straw to give it the proper consistence.

The kingdom passed through an experience more or less common to other kingdoms. From barbarism to conquest, from conquest to untold wealth; then came internal discord, faithlessness of treaties with neighbouring powers; decline, invasion, and overthrow. So far all seems in accordance with the ordinary course of events. But the kingdom was founded on a Divine promise, and we may still trace the letters of that promise upon those parts of the mighty wreck which time has cast upon our shores. Differing from all other nations in religion, Israel was monotheistic in worship; and for her one God she claimed greater power than was possessed by all the vaunted gods of the nations round about. Her faith in this respect rested on facts seen with her own eyes, but when their repetition ceased for any considerable period, the remembrance of those things on which her confidence was built quickly faded. Hence she may be truly said to have walked by sight, and not by faith. In this millenium we behold the kingdom of God historically displayed. God Himself governed the affairs of His own kingdom; for although Moses is spoken of as "king in Jeshurun," this was not to the exclusion of Jehovah, nor was Moses king in the modern acceptance of the word. We know him as Moses, "the servant of God." We regard him as the visible administrator of the Divine will; but acting in no way as if the kingdom appertained to himself. Moses represents the era of legislation, or law-making; hence he is commonly referred to as the law-giver. He belonged more especially to the foundational period of the kingdom, while his successor, Joshua, is the great representative of conquest.

When the time came for God to establish His kingdom on the earth, the territory on which He had determined to erect it was occupied by strong and numerous idolatrous nations; and we are told that the primary reason of their removal was their abominable practices. So that God did not deal harshly or arbitrarily in setting up His kingdom in the land of Palestine, but He took advantage of the opportunity thus afforded for making room for His own government. No person who is ignorant of the history of Israel can form just ideas concerning the kingdom of God, for, apart from that history there is neither reality in relation to the past, nor certainty as respects the future. The period of the Judges, who succeeded Joshua, was the time of teaching and consolidation in Divine law. But the nation grew tired of this simplicity and dependence upon an invisible Ruler; and in the days of the prophet Samuel “asked a king like unto the nations round about.” This provoked the displeasure of the Almighty “who was their king.” It was equivalent to rebellion and deposition, had deposition been possible. Nevertheless, God permitted it, commanding the grieved and protesting prophet to listen to the nation’s desire. But God retained priority. He selected Saul, and after him David, and for ever established the royalty in David’s family. When we come to the reign of Solomon, we have the plain declaration that “Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord.” This makes David’s throne the throne of Jehovah. All thrones are indeed, His; and heaven is called His throne, but not in that particular sense in which He claims the throne of David.

Solomon stands before us as the builder of the Temple of God, where, from between the wings of the cherubim, the Deity uttered His voice; “dwelling,” though invisible, “with men.” During this era, the kingdom of God enjoyed unrivalled prosperity and peace; the period, as well as the king is usually considered typical of a time when it will be said “a greater than Solomon is here.” Then we have the division of the kingdom of God into two hostile monarchies, followed by the Assyrian invasion, and the carrying away of the Ten Tribes, of whom there has yet been no return. Judah’s captivity came next and, strictly speaking, the kingdom of God retained after that downfall, no proper existence. The subsequent period of five hundred years was one of “overturning,” until settled desolation set in like a long dark winter’s night, which, after the lapse of nearly two thousand years, is only faintly relieved by a glimmer of dawn - happy herald of the rising sun. Israel’s sun went down blood-red, in a dark and angry sky, leaving behind a mass of inky clouds unlit by a solitary star. But, hark! The murmuring voice of the returning waters breaks upon the ear. The sound comes creeping, like the tide, rustling, and sighing as it lifts and sways the seaweed-beds, and climbs among the giant rocks. Yes, Israel lives, though scattered, and He who scattered will surely gather.

The kingdom of God in the past exhibits nothing akin to the fancies of the multitude concerning a kingdom of God in the present, or even in the future; it was not some undefined, unsubstantial sacred thing, veiled in flimsy drapery and dreamy adoration. No: it was a politico-religious constitution, comprising millions of human beings; a fine army; a noble hierarchy, a splendid temple, and a more splendid ritual; a vast and varied territory stretching along the Eastern border of the Mediterranean Sea, and far back towards the Arabian desert; its fruitfulness, its richness of scenery second to none upon our beautiful globe. Here was a kingdom of God, truly solid and brilliant. From this magnificent kingdom of the past, ideas equally just and exalted ought to be formed of the still more glorious kingdom of the future. This is the Christian’s guiding type. Though “not the very image” of the promised “rest,” it is a bold clear outline, the leading characteristics of which the prophets and apostles enable an intelligent mind to fill in with tolerable accuracy. But nothing is more certain than that neither it nor they point in any other direction for the attainment of the life and inheritance to come. This kingdom was the glory of God who founded it; the pride of the rulers and subjects who possessed it; the admiration and envy of contemporary nations; and the restoration of it was the hope of the enlightened apostles and disciples of the Lord. The best laws of all civilized peoples have been borrowed from its code, and so sure as the prophets are true, will that same code yet become the main feature of “the law which shall go forth from Zion,” when there shall be one law and one king.

THE OLD NAME.

We come now to speak of “the kingdom of Israel,” not as so much territory, but as composed of millions of human beings incorporated into a grand politico-religious name. It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the name which was written upon the nation of Israel was the name of Jehovah. This inscription took place at their passage over the dry bed of the Red Sea. They, by that act, “were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea;” and, as Moses stood in the relation of God to them, they thus took upon themselves “the glorious and fearful name.” In looking at Israel after this event we recognise the name

of God in a material sense. It is no longer an abstraction or a motto; it lives and moves to and fro in the wilderness of Sinai, and afterwards takes up a long settled abode in the Land of Promise. The consideration of the Divine Name in this aspect we shall find to have been instructive when we turn our thoughts, in a future article, to another view of the same subject,- a view which is connected with our own personal relation to God, both now and for all time.

The politics of Israel, their worship embracing prayer, song, and offerings, were things pertaining to the then existing kingdom of God, and to His name. And here we observe a vast array of imposing realities constituting the civil and religious life of a great people. Now, if these were shadows, as we are apostolically taught, of good things to come, the substance must surely be as real as that which foreshadowed it. This reflection will throw, perhaps, a useful light upon the substance itself.

The dissolution of "The Old Name" resulted from rebellion against God. It had been formed by obedience to His will. When the chosen people forsook Jehovah, His wrath was kindled, and He spake, saying, "The Lord God shall slay thee, and call His servants by another name." This dreadful threat was fulfilled in the overthrow of the kingdom. It is not unreasonable to conclude that the Old Name would have remained undisturbed to this day but for disobedience which mocked at mercy.

This municipality consisted of various orders and ranks of men, from the king down to the porter at the gate. It was a name written in the foreheads of all, from the prince to the beggar. Those who came into it, not of the seed of Abraham, were called proselytes. At the time of the exodus a number of persons joined themselves to Israel in this capacity. The building up of this great and mighty name was not the labour of a day. The energies and patience of Moses and Aaron were many times all but exhausted in the work. From the chronicles of the different prophets we observe the successive steps by which it declined, and the causes of its ultimate destruction. By Jeremiah it is likened to a rotten linen girdle; its binding and cleaving force has wasted away, and that which had once been an encircling zone of power became "marred" and "good for nothing." Such, in brief, is the composition, the history, and the end of the nation designed by God "for a name, and for a praise, and for a glory: but they would not hear."

CHAPTER XIV.

THE AGE OF PEACE.—THE NEW NAME.

In the mythology of the Greek and Roman poets the history of the world was divided into four ages, the golden, the silver, the brazen, and the iron; as, for instance, by Hesiod, in his poem, entitled 'Works and Days,' and by Ovid, in his 'Metamorphoses' (Book i.). The golden age, when Saturn reigned, is represented as having been that of perfect innocence and happiness, from which the others have gradually degenerated - the iron age, or that which now subsists, being the most wicked and miserable of all." According to other accounts "the golden age is represented as the triumph of civilization over previous barbarism; whereas the former version seems intended to indicate that the primeval state of man was that in which he enjoyed the greatest felicity. The two statements, therefore, may be taken as expressing two opposite theories or opinions, which have divided speculators upon this subject even to our own day."

Such is the yearning expression of the heart of mankind in regard to The Age of Peace. One great division found it in the far-off past; the other expects it in the wished-for future. Speculation, conducted without the aid of God's utterances, is not of much value upon this interesting subject; it tends, however, to show that man sustains a relation to a better constitution of things, faintly shadowed out in the universal desire for a permanent era of undisturbed tranquillity and happiness; but it entirely fails to give any reliable information as a guide for faith, and as an anchor to hope.

There is a very ancient tradition that, as the creation of the world occupied six days and the Creator rested on the seventh, so the world of humanity was destined to labour and fatigue for six thousand years, and then to enter upon the enjoyment of rest and peace for a thousand years more. This analogy is both natural and pleasing; it appears also, according to certain texts of Holy Writ, to combine the immense advantage of being true, so far as it relates to the thousand years of rest. Rev. v. 10; xx. 6. The same

conclusion might be arrived at by inference from the divisions of time by the Mosaic law, and the Divine injunctions with respect to those periods. Every reader will understand that we allude to the jubilees. The idea of a Heavenly Millennium pervades the New Testament, especially the discourses of Christ and the letters of the apostles. "Come unto me, all that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest". Again, "the rest that remaineth for the people of God." While of the wicked it is written, "there is no rest for them." The words of Jesus go straight to the heart. There is hardly a son or a daughter of Adam in whose breast they have not, at one time or another, met a responsive throb; so admirably adapted to the necessities of the case are the means of the Restorer and Comforter.

From the last to the first of the prophets the golden age is portrayed as a time of material blessedness on earth, not of immaterial "bliss" in heaven. The order in which the Hebrew seers describe what they see begins always with their own people, the Jews; from them they pass to the nations, in one or two instances specifying a certain order of rank in which Israel invariably has the pre-eminence. The character, therefore, of the golden age is not left to imagination and fancy. Whoever will be at the trouble to study the prophets - with whom Christ and the apostles are in harmony - will perceive clearly what is the nature of that promised universal happiness, though we are not sufficiently informed of its details to be able to follow the occupations of the world in the future age, from day to day; neither can we do this, except in a very limited degree, with regard to great nations that are past: their history, as it has come down to us, only furnishes a few of the salient features of their life. It is probable, if not indubitable, that the golden age will, in certain respects, resemble the state of things in the days of Christ and the apostles: that is, it will be a time of the miraculous inter-mingling with the natural; the lame will be healed, the blind will receive their sight, and even, what seems greatest of all miracles, the dead, perhaps, will be raised to life again. If there was a need, as all will admit, for the performance of wonderful works in the era of Christ's first sojourn among men, will there not be a greater need for the same benefits upon a scale as wide as the world itself when He returns to take up His final residence with man? The Prophets and the New Testament also conduce to this expectation.

The Position of the Jews. - "He (Messiah) shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, as in the days of old, and as in former (margin, ancient) years (Mal iii. 3, 4). The last words of this prediction mark the period. "Yea, every pot in Jerusalem, and in Judah, shall be holiness unto the LORD of Hosts; and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and see the therein; and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the LORD of Hosts." (Zee. xiv. 21). The concluding part of this prophecy goes beyond the present condition of the land and city, which are full of Canaanites, or enemies of Jehovah. "Jerusalem shall be called a city of truth." (chap. viii. 8). "My cities, through prosperity, shall yet be spread abroad; and the LORD shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem." (chap. i. 17). This language finds no adequate response in the history of Israel since -the time the prophet wrote: "Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The LORD hath taken away thy judgments. He hath cast out thine enemy; the King of Israel, even the LORD, is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more." (Zeph. iii. 14, 15). "Behold, upon the mountains the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts, perform thy vows, for the wicked shall no more pass through thee; he is utterly cut off" (Nahum i. 15). "They shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them; and I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the LORD thy God." (Amos ix. 14, 15). As the testimonies are numberless foretelling the material blessedness of Israel, their holiness, and political greatness, we need add no more; but will proceed to cite several other prophecies, which point out the respective status of Jews and Gentiles in the age of peace.

The position and esteem of the Gentiles in relation to Israel. - "Thus saith the LORD of Hosts, In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold, out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." (Zech. viii. 23), "Ye shall be named the priests of the LORD; men shall call you the ministers of our God; ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves. Strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen and your vinedressers." (Isa. lxi. 6, 5). "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." (chap. ix. 12). This foreshadows universal subjection to God's chosen nation, a state of things partially

carried out in ancient times, so long as they obeyed the Divine commands. This political order will abolish all modern ideas concerning “the balance of power,” an equilibrium which it is impossible to maintain. “Thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people, and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet” (chap. xlix. 22, 28). It is not unreasonable to infer that proud reflection on texts of this class induced arrogance and self glorification, and led the Jew to despise the Gentile. It was not the wealth of Israel that was designed to operate their exaltation and refinement. The Spirit said, “Behold I have refined thee, but not with (margin /or) silver; I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction.” (chap. xlvi. 10).

The rank of several principal nations. - “In that day, Israel shall be reckoned a third, together with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, whom Jehovah of Hosts hath blessed, saying, Blessed be my people Egypt; and Assyria, the work of my hands; and Israel my inheritance.” - chap. xix. 24, 25, (Lowth’s translation). Although Israel is here.” reckoned a third,” or as in the common version “the third,” the meaning is not that the other two stand higher in rank, for she is immediately spoken of as “mine inheritance;” and in another prophecy it is said “she shall have the first dominion.” (Micah iv. 8), which agrees with the texts before quoted from Isaiah, and with others, to the effect that she will be “the head and not the tail” among the nations of the earth.

The peace and prosperity of the nations. - “All the earth sitteth still, and is at rest” (Zech. i. 11). “And He shall speak peace unto the heathen; and His dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.” (Zech. ix. 10). Part of this is a quotation from the seventy-second Psalm. “Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people.” (Rom. xv. 10). “O Praise the LORD, all ye nations: praise Him all ye people. For His merciful kindness is great toward us: and the truth of the LORD endureth forever.” (Ps. cxvii. 1, 2). “The mountains shall bring peace to the people.” (Ps. lxxii. 8). That is, peace shall be proclaimed from the top of the mountains; or the empires and kingdoms shall speak peace to their subjects. “Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end.” (Isa. ix. 7). And on earth peace, good will toward men (Luke ii. 14).

Religious worship of the nations. - “For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may call upon the name of the LORD, to serve Him with owe consent” (Zeph. iii. 9). “All kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him.” (Psa. lxxii. 11). “Every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year (to Jerusalem) to worship the King, the LORD of Hosts.” (Zech. xiv. 16). “For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen saith the Lord of Hosts.” (Mal. i. 11). “Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the LORD, to serve Him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be His servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.” (Isa. lvi. 6, 7)

Feasts and Ceremonies. - O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts: perform thy vows: for the wicked shall no more pass through thee.” (Nahum. i. 15). They shall “go up to the feast of tabernacles.” (Zech. xiv. 16). This is a feast of offerings by fire seven days, during which the people live out of doors, in booths of canvas, decorated with the boughs and branches of trees, a time of great enjoyment after harvest. This universal feast on the hills and in the valleys roundabout Jerusalem, will eclipse everything of the kind attempted hitherto. Men of every nation and tribe will be there; every shade of skin, from the fair white European to the inky Nubian; with all their varieties of costume and manners; and the ministers in the services will be able, like the apostles at Pentecost, to address every man in his own tongue wherein he was born. We may imagine in some degree the general effect of this scene, and the feelings and impressions the visitors will carry away with them to their homes, where they will tell of having seen the King in His beauty, and of hearing the speech of Him, who, two thousand years before, was betrayed and murdered in the same city. Many hearts will swell, and eyes fill, as they hear the stories of their friends. And thus the years will roll away, till the sound and art of war are forgotten. Man will rest and brighten in the peace and light of Him

who is the true Light, and the Prince of Peace; he will pass the boundary that now separates this moral wilderness from that stainless Eden, and hold fellowship with the "morning stars" and all the sons of Deity.

THE NEW NAME.

The highest aspiration of the disciple of the Lord is the attainment of what is styled in the language of Holy Writ the New Name. Some slight knowledge of this would be foreshadowed by our article in the preceding chapter, entitled the Old Name. A multitudinous aggregate of people bearing the Name of Jehovah was briefly shown to be the idea contained in the writings of Moses and the Prophets. But as that name has been cast off for many centuries, it becomes a question whether it is designed to be restored, and in what manner. Before entering upon the consideration of an answer, it will be in order to say a word about the meaning of Jehovah's name.

First, then, let it be observed that man could not have known by what name to designate the Deity unless the Deity had communicated to him the knowledge of His name. Moses anticipated this when he was about to go to the Israelites sunk in bondage and barbarism. "They will say, what is His name?"

We remark, also, that up to a certain epoch the Deity had been revealed to Abraham and others, by the name Almighty; and that, thenceforth, He desired to be known by the name Jehovah. No person, who is really interested and thoughtful in his perusal of the Scriptures, could pass over this passage without pausing to enquire and reflect. He would naturally ask himself. What is the meaning of the word Almighty, and what the meaning of the name Jehovah, and why was the change made from the one to the other? It would, probably, occur to the reader's mind that in God's dealings with men - with idolaters who trusted in their false deities - the first object on the part of the true God would be to impress them with a due sense of His infinite power. He was, therefore, during a long period known to a select and obedient few as the Almighty - "able to perform all He had promised;" "Is there anything too hard for the Lord?" This primary and essential lesson being taught and well-fixed in the mind of His children, God next proceeded to reveal, not all at once, but "at sundry times and in divers manners," His future purposes; and He chose to do this partly in the significance of the name by which He would be known. It is no new, but yet no unimportant observation, that the name Jehovah points to the future. The Jews, to this day, profess deep awe, and, to some extent, ignorance too, concerning the name Jehovah. They never attempt to utter it, on the ground that they have no tradition as to the proper pronounciation; how their high priest pronounced Jehovah they know not, and so they give to it quite another form and sound, viz., Adonai, the Hebrew word for Lord. But this explains nothing; it leaves the earnest investigator as much in the dark upon the subject as the rendering given by our translators of the name Jehovah, which is, "I am, that I am;" for neither the word Lord, nor the phrase, "I am, that I am," conveys the true sense of the word Jehovah, which signifies "He who will be." The mere confident assertion, "I am," could satisfy no one, nor does it appear that any benefit could accrue from the change if that were all, or if that were indeed what was intended; for the name Almighty clearly carried the idea of existence in the most forcible manner. But "I will be," or "He who will be," is very different, and would produce as different an impression on the minds of those to whom it was made known. Instead of resting vaguely in the present, their eyes would peer towards the future, and the general query would be, Who is this "I will be?" "I will be" what, and when? While this new announcement would keep the watchful anxiously and diligently searching, none would be able to furnish a correct reply until the light of the fulfilment of the assurance broke upon the world; and even then not all who were professedly vigilant perceived that the promise was fulfilled, or rather that the fulfilment of it had begun.

This prophetic and once mysterious name, "I will be," may now, by the clear light of history, and, in consequence of that history, the less obscure light of still unaccomplished prophecy, be paraphrased as follows:- "I, Jehovah, will be to Israel and the nations a Saviour." The rays of this ancient promise streamed through the long pre-adventual darkness, struck upon the manger and the cross, passed shaft-like through the tomb, shot upwards to the heavens, hereafter to burst in one luminous flood over all the earth, ever to remain for the perfect guidance of mankind. In their first transit the benignant rays revealed from deepest shade one figure - Jesus of Nazareth, - in their final diffusion, a star-like multitude will be beheld, resembling the soft and brilliant canopy of night.

With the advent of Jesus, the time came to begin the manifestation of the name of the Deity to men; not to all, but to His brethren, as David had said: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren." Psa. xxii. 22. Accordingly, He of whom this was written, spake thus, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which

thou gavest me out of the world.” (Jon. xvii. 6). This declaring and manifesting were one and the same work. In the teaching of Jesus, the restoration of His nation, the punishment and ultimate destruction of the wicked, the resuscitation and immortalization of the righteous dead, the government of the world by Himself and His disciples, were the burden of His word. These things were, at best, but darkly conjectured in the ages before His proclamation; but by His preaching and that of His apostles, the Father’s name, or purpose, was “declared,” “manifested,” or made easy of comprehension.

The intent of declaring and manifesting the Father’s name, may be distinctly seen from the context of the words above quoted: “And they have kept thy word. Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given are of thee. For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.” What those words were which the Father gave to His well-beloved Son, may be certainly known from two passages, the one in Isaiah lxi. 1-8, and the other in Luke iv. 16-21. Let the reader peruse and re-peruse this declaration of the prophet, by the light of the gospel narratives, and he will not be ignorant of the name or purposes of the Deity in Christ.

Immediately after Saul’s conversion, Ananias was told by the Lord that He had chosen Paul to “bear His name before the Gentiles.” Christ’s preaching was the manifestation of His Father’s name; Paul’s ministry was bearing the name before the Gentiles. “When the fullness of the time was come,” the purpose of the Most High was to be looked for through that Son who had proceeded from Himself; made of a woman, Jesus took hold of the humanity He was sent to redeem and rule; so that in a visible substantial way the Increate, the Invisible, He whom men could not even hear without one to intervene, was seen and heard in the person and voice of His only begotten Son. The Son, therefore, was the visible, tangible attestation, the “Surety” for the fulfilment of the great and precious promises concealed in the self-imposed Name of the Creator of heaven and earth.

From these remarks it appears that the name of the Deity and of Christ is presented in the Word under two aspects - doctrinally and substantially. The doctrine refers to the intentions of the Creator revealed from time to time in their gradual development; the substantial refers to the agents through whom those intentions are to be carried out to the predetermined consummation. It is this latter view of the great design which agrees with the apostolic labours of “taking out a people for the name.” Here it becomes evident that the name is not for ever to be only an abstract purpose, but that it is to be Deity Himself manifested to the world through material, solid, deathless, human forms. The foundation of this was the begetting of Jesus, who was an actual manifestation in flesh of Him that begat, and like unto the “First-born,” by faith and obedience are to be made all those “who are called according to His purpose.” Whence it follows that the assumption or putting on of the New Name is perfected through the two-fold action of mental change and bodily transformation. In Jesus Christ the Jehovah-Name began in the flesh common to man; it terminated in spirit, the essential property of God. Thus it will be with the members one and all; they have partaken of the earthy, and they will also partake of the heavenly. So that when men and women who understand and affectionately believe the proclaimed Name, in other words, “the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ,” are baptized into His name, they do not merely declare their adhesion to a certain form of doctrine, they take up a position for “the world to come” - life and incorruptibility organised into a ruling power, the head of which is Christ, whose invisible head is God.

We have said “organised into a ruling power.” The terms with which the name is coupled, the work assigned to those who are its constituents, all point clearly to such organisation; hence it is plain that the glorified saints are not to spend their time in vague, self-absorbing enjoyments, but that they will be engaged in regular and benevolent, yet “tireless labour.” Turn to a few passages. “Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God; and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him, the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is New Jerusalem.” (Rev. iii. 12). Here are the terms “temple,” “city,” “New Jerusalem.” These denote religious and political arrangement. “Temple” points to the ecclesiasticism of the saints, “city” to their municipality, “New Jerusalem” to their metropolitan eminence. Let these things be considered, and it will be seen that there is a real life in the “world to come” far more analogous to this present existence than many religious persons are inclined to believe. And this accords with reason, and the necessity of the case. It is not a question of government or no government, but one of wise rule or misrule. Human authority is unavoidably very imperfect at best. The exaltation of Jehovah’s name in all the earth will inaugurate the divine, and, therefore, perfect government of the world.

Reader, art thou in the great Name; has it been written on thy forehead, or intellect? Hast thou put it on in baptism? Hast thou been adopted from the family of the first into the family of the second Adam? If thou hast, then there is “now no condemnation” to thee, thou art passed from death unto life; by faith thou hast been translated into the kingdom of God’s dear Son, and if thou continuest to walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit, thou wilt find thyself endowed with wisdom, and honour, and immortality in the society of God’s “jewels” of every age, to go no more out, to cease from every ill which afflicts the flesh, and to exult in an unending career of happiness and power.

CHAPTER XV.

RECAPITULATION.

Our aim has been to write upon the two sons of God in a collective as well as in an individual sense; the object being to prove that the first son, whether considered as one person or as many, was made a slave to sin, and became the property of the grave: the other son was never in this calamity. The second Adam was always free and “undefiled,” and those in Him are without condemnation; this freedom accrues from adoption on the basis of intelligent obedience. It is called being made free by truth, and such freedom is complete, the subjects of it being said to be “free indeed.”

The origin of all things and of man was spirit, of the nature of which the wisest are ignorant, as also of the mode of its change to the visible creation.

The headship and responsibility belong to man, for though first in the transgression the consequences to posterity are not charged upon the woman - both are regarded as one.

The nature of the first sin, and the circumstances under which it was committed, is virtually what all sin has been since, forbidden use of natural desire. Evil is the penalty or result of sin, and always to be distinguished from it. The sentence of death took away life and restored nonentity of personal being and consciousness - the end was dust. By disobedience the way to God’s presence and favour was cut off; and man was estranged from spiritual life and from fellowship with the Spirit. His alienation and consequent nakedness being deeply felt and lamented, covering for sin was provided on the condition of repentance or change of mind and conduct. The former innocence of the sinner was seen in the spotlessness of the victims offered, a premonition of the death of the just for the unjust, the strongest motive to pity and gratitude. The spilling of the life in the dust displayed the magnitude of the offence and the impossibility of restoration without the intervention of the life Giver. The twofold character of the world is seen in Cain and Abel; and the first climax of universal sin in the deluge; the ark and its human occupants testifying to the watchfulness and justice of Jehovah in separating the chaff from the wheat.

With Noah the world began afresh, the bow of peace reassured men’s hearts, being a symbol of the guiding hand of the Creator. Faith beyond the grave, through divinely appointed sacrifice, is the grand characteristic of the Abrahamic age. In the patriarch it received a God-like test and confirmation in the offering of his only son. The end of hope was - “the Lord will provide.”

II.

The annual day of atonement was a shadow too large and deep for the average Jewish mind to grasp and fathom. The dying victims and the crimson sea constituted too vast and imposing a ceremony to be fulfilled and put away by the valueless blood of a young Galilean peasant and carpenter. In what humility God came forth to reconcile the world unto Himself! and the world slew Him in the person of His only Son! He, says the apostle, is our propitiation, and not for us only but for the sins of the whole world. Jesus also became “the tabernacle of witness” - the highest witness for the truth. The true sanctuary was to consist of human hearts, circumcised without hands, wherein the Deity should be enshrined throughout eternity, first, as in the holy, afterwards as in the most holy place. This House being Christ’s was purchased and cleansed with His own

blood. He is the light thereof and the perpetual bread of the Divine presence. To see Him and to eat of this bread is to live forever. The rent veil reveals "the end." In Him the Father dwells with man. He is the newly slain yet living way; and saith, "I am he that liveth, and was dead and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen." The Holy of Holies, or man's heaven, is not "beyond the stars;" but is a morally and religiously purified earth whereon God's will shall be done even as it is in heaven. The Burnt Sacrifice declared the destruction of sin by the perfection of the offering; which was conspicuously strengthened by the prohibition of all unclean beasts as victims for sin. The imperfection of the shadow was seen in the high priest's offering for himself before he could consecrate his house. Christ offered once - Himself for the sins of the world. The two goats were needful, the first to show the effect of sin upon the sacrifice on whom it was laid, the second, the justice of escape from death after paying the price of ransom.

III.

The phrase the second Adam carries within it all the essential parallels between Adam and Jesus. It involves a similitude of nature, of situation, and of trial; but not an identity of issue. The relationship of the one to the other was as necessary as the perfect freedom and obedience of the latter were to the deliverance of the former. The starting was the same in each case; the ending was failure in the 'first, victory in the last. The two trials were human; the miraculous powers and communications which either had from and with heaven were no part of and had no concern in the moral probationary career. Divine Sonship and training were not affected and biased by the supernatural. Absolute perfection is beyond the reach of men and of angels too - it belongs to God alone. But perfect obedience, in the sense in which perfection is in the New Testament predicated of men, is possible to the saints though extremely rare. God imposes no law impossible to obey, and requires no obedience impossible to yield. The source of a river may be pure and delightful, while its unchained waters spread devastation far and wide; and those propensities and passions which are chaste and holy operating within divine limitations are mad and ruinous without restraint. We are strengthened and comforted by the example of those persons who have walked righteously before God. Death ruined creation, but love healed the breach. The love of God can only be felt by man in proportion to his ability to look upon God as the Father of Jesus, and Jesus as the Son of God. The scale on which we do this is that fixed by our own feelings, well cultured, towards our own offspring; and the man is more to be pitied than envied who can dwell on this theme without emotion. But no person who does not deplore in all its depth the effect of sin can know in its height the power of love. The only heir of all things is Jesus. This right comes of His being God's Son, a claim denied to the highest angel. While we behold Jesus acting as a servant of men, we must not overlook the fact that He took upon Himself this form, but in reality He was by birthright Lord of all. Herein lies His redemptive power.

IV.

Jesus is the counterpart and substance of more than one Bible celebrity. Melchisedec and Aaron were types of His priesthood. The perfection of the priest was no less requisite than that of the sacrifice. The Seed of God finds its strongest exemplification in the person of Jesus. The term applies also to the saints who by adoption and covering are held faultless, and to be so presented, how strongly this corroborates the faultlessness of Jesus their Redeemer. A due and proper attention to this title - the Seed - will reveal the root of "the tree of life" on to which the saints are grafted as branches. Bethel, or the house of God, is scarcely less forcible as indicating not only the separation of its elements from the world, but its giving prominence and original purity to the Lord of the household. He is described as the foundation and headstone. The flesh is not sin, nor is it evil, for God pronounced it "very good," and it remains the same in both men and beasts. But it is capable of sin, and therefore of producing or bringing evil on itself by the transgression of law. But it is equally capable of keeping law and evading evil. The necessity for this condition lies in the justice of punishment for crime and reward for obedience and the man is said to be in the flesh or not in the flesh as he is living in one or other of these states. Those who have become Christians, though they afterwards walk unworthy of their calling, are still described as not in the flesh, because they formerly passed from the flesh to the spirit, in the sense in which we are now using these terms.

V.

“In the Spirit” is sometimes literal, at others figurative. Literal, it refers to the immortalisation of the believers of the gospel at the second appearing of Christ; figurative, to that state of the understanding and the heart by which a true believer is known to God as His. Only Christians are in the spirit in this sense. The Spirit in a miraculous manner appears to have been at times in the possession of bad as well as good men, from which it seems that to be in the spirit, or to have the mind and disposition of Christ, is of more value than that faith which removes mountains. “The natural man” is the mind unenlightened, or if partially illuminated still opposed to the teaching of the Scriptures. This is sin. It is a great evil, but it is no sin, nor indeed a calamity to be in the flesh or natural body, but rather an advantage, for through it we may rise to the spiritual body. “This mortal shall put on immortality.” He that is spiritual is not of necessity one who has undergone bodily change, but one who has understood and embraced the things of the Spirit comprised in the formula - “the Gospel of the Kingdom of God,” and who endeavours to adorn the doctrine in all things. The last thing that would occur to such a person would be to boast of his spiritual mindedness.

VI.

No sooner was death in the world, according to the sentence pronounced on Adam, than the Almighty in His mercy promised life to the man who had brought death upon himself. But He promised it conditionally, and the conditions are seen in the gospel; a system of means for salvation fully developed after the ascension of Christ. His last charge to His disciples by the Spirit was. Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned. This promise of immortality excludes the popular belief of its present possession in the mortal body, and rests all man’s hopes on the resurrection of the dead. The inheritance - the only inheritance - offered in the Bible to man is the earth which he now inhabits. For many thousands of years the earth has been gradually improving in beauty and fitness as a dwelling place, and will become still more beautiful through the action of those laws by which the Creator controls her, together with the culture she receives from men. The natural beauties of the earth are frequently the theme of the Psalmist and the Prophets. The declared purpose of God is to remove the wicked by death, and to give the earth into the possession of the righteous, at the head of whom is placed His own Son Jesus the Christ. “The meek shall inherit the earth; they shall dwell therein forever. They shall flourish; they shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.” This is the Creator’s gracious offer to man - immortality and the everlasting inheritance of the earth. The blood of His only Son was shed to secure these blessings.

VII.

The sinless Jesus was made the sin bearer, and all Scripture which speaks of sin, as His means His by imputation. It was “laid on Him,” not born in Him. Many hyperboles concerning the sorrows and sufferings of the Christ occur in the Psalms. Sinful flesh is an impossible thing, because it makes the Creator of the flesh the author of sin. All human flesh, except that which has been redeemed by Christ, belongs to sin by right of sale and service, and is therefore Sin’s flesh. There is no more mischievous error in translation in the whole Bible than Romans viii. 8, which should not read “sinful” but “sin’s flesh.” The Holy Spirit is by many supposed to intercede for man because his fleshly nature is full of sin; but this is to make God the perpetrator of a contradiction. Why not have made the flesh so as not to need Holy Spirit? How can a man repent of what he cannot help, or feel thankful for intercession about that which was imposed upon him by nature? This amounts to an abolition of free will and thus destroys responsibility.

VIII.

The seed of the serpent is wholly a figure of speech. It signifies the posterity of Adam only; but is never applied to any who have been adopted into and remain in the family of God. In other words the children of the second Adam are not regarded as the children of the first. When a man is “in Christ” he is no longer “in Adam.” Christ was related to Adam by His mother, but was never in Adam, because God was His father. The woman’s seed is distinctive. It affirms a seed not of men. Literally, this was true of Jesus; figuratively, it is true of His brethren.

It is by adoption that we become members of the new creation in Christ Jesus; but this can only result from our receiving Jesus as the Christ, and believing the things testified of Him by the prophets: - that He

should be the Son of God - that He should be slain as a sin-offering - that He should rise from the dead - that He should be a high priest, and, finally, that He should reign over the nations of the earth upon the throne of His father, David. Those who cordially receive Jesus in this manner, as the Scripture declares Him, to them He gives power to become the sons of God. The change of mind and heart which ensues upon the reception of Jesus as above described, attested by baptism into Him for remission of sins that are past, is designated being "born again," after which we ought to desire the unadulterated milk of the word, then strong meat, that we may attain unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

IX.

Election is conditional. The elect are the believers; and belief arises from acquisition of testimony to facts and promises. God has elected those only who believe and obey the truth, as revealed in the gospel of the Kingdom of God. These he has fore-known and foreordained to glorification because they believe.

X.

Temptation arises from within. Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts. A man is drawn away of his own lust. This is pictured in various ways, but the root of the matter is in the heart. Things external may be the occasion of sin, but the real cause lies in man's own desire. Desire is holy, just, and good in itself; but out of bounds it is sin, and followed by all evil. Let us not mistake the shadow for the substance.

XI.

Jesus was the Son of God by birth, He was the Christ by anointing Christ signifies anointed. When Jesus died, the Christ or the anointed died; but not the Chrisma, or anointing spirit. This is God's spirit. There is one Spirit. Saul was still God's anointed after his rebellion and casting off. The enmity subsisting between Jew and Gentile, also between God and all mankind, was slain in the cutting off of Messiah; but the full reconciliation is yet to be accomplished. Jesus is the great peace-maker, and will establish this desirable oneness when He reigns in Jerusalem over the nations. All will then agree to serve Him with one consent. It is now our duty and privilege to exhibit that same spirit which in Him gave His life for the world.

XII.

Two great systems are taught in the Bible; the mystery of godliness and the mystery of iniquity. The Papacy has so far identified itself with the latter as to wear the word "Mystery" on the front of the Pope's mitre; and, as if to acknowledge the charge, removed the badge at the taunts of Protestants. The high priesthood, sacrifice, forgiveness of sins, and regal authority over all, make up a huge and monstrous counterfeit to which no other institution has any pretension. It is a complete usurpation of Christ's place. Christ will utterly destroy it at His appearing and His Kingdom. Until then it will flourish in its spiritual, if not its temporal power. The Sun is a title or figure applicable to the glorified believers as well as to Jesus. They are portrayed as shining as the Sun in the Kingdom of their Father; and constitute the light of the world.

XIII.

The Kingdom of Israel, of which we have treated under the title of the "Old Millenium," was not the only Kingdom of God, but it was a type of that Kingdom when it shall be re-established with Jesus Christ upon the throne of David, and His apostles on twelve thrones ruling the twelve tribes of Israel, and the other saints ruling over the nations. No person who fails to comprehend and believe these things can show that he understands "the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ," preached by Philip and Paul; and on account of which belief, men and women were baptised for remission of past sins, and hope of eternal life in the Kingdom of God. While Israel were in obedience to Moses' law, and dwelling in their own land they formed A Name brilliant and powerful, and were a shadow of the New Name.

XIV.

It would require the pen of poet and prophet to portray the glories of the Golden Age. Eden was a faint image of it, and the palmiest days of King Solomon another type. All important questions of morals, estate, religion, and politics, will find a clear, just, and final solution in that happy era; delivered from the numberless ills now springing out of the human heart, mankind will rest and flourish. Idleness, intemperance, covetousness, and their attendant crimes will be crushed out of society; and the labour of the hands will be more than sufficient to supply all natural and well-regulated wants. Under the tuition of Christ and the Saints, men's minds will be greatly enlarged and brightened; and, directed heavenward, the leisure for devotion will stamp upon them the impress of their Creator.

The New Name, yet to be "exalted in all the earth," is composed of obedient believers of the Gospel - Jew and Gentile. Unto this Name every knee shall bow; and through the administration of those who constitute it, "the whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the depths of the sea." Christ's gospel is designed to take out of the Gentiles a people for His Name; those who testify to their intelligent and hearty acceptance of it by baptism into the Name, become component parts of Christ's Body mystical, and heirs of that inheritance which is undefiled, and that fadeth not away; reserved in heaven, ready to be revealed in the last time.

CONCLUSION.

It was not our design to exhaust the numerous topics spoken of in this Treatise, but rather to present them suggestively, leaving to the interested and studious reader the pleasure of discovering in the Scriptures, much more testimony that will sustain and beautify the various points so briefly and imperfectly sketched out. Let him bring to the subject a calm, earnest, candid mind: let him think of the lesson inculcated by Christ, Except ye become teachable as a little child, ye can in no wise enter the Kingdom of God."

AN OUTLINE OF THE ANCIENT GOSPEL

In Twenty-seven Questions and Answers;

WITH PROOF TEXTS IN FULL.

1. - What is the meaning of Gospel? Answer. Good tidings.

Proof. The Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings. - ISA. LXI. 1. The Lord hath anointed me to preach the gospel. - LUKE iv. 18.

2. - What is the meaning of The Gospel? Answer. The word the points out some particular Gospel, viz., that which the Apostles preached.

Proof. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you.—GAL. i. 8.

3. - Why call it the Ancient Gospel? Answer. Because it was "ancient" even in the days of the Apostles.

Proof. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham. - GAL. iii. 8.

4. - What is this Gospel about? Answer. It consists of "the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ."

Proof. And when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ.—ACTS vii. 12.

5. - And what is “the Kingdom of God?” Answer. It is a Kingdom to be established on the earth by God.
Proof. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. - DAN. n. 44. And there was given him (Messiah) a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him. - AN. vii. 14. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. - LUKE xi. 2. And we (the saints) shall reign on the earth.—REV. v. 10.

6. - Who is to be the King? Answer. Jesus the Christ.
Proof. Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. PSA.II.6. All kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him. PSA. LXXII. 11. The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and-of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. - REV. xi. 15.

7. By what other name is “the Kingdom of God” known? Answer. It is known in Scripture by the name of “the Kingdom of Israel.”

Proof. Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? - ACTS. i. 6. Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest. - MARK xi. 10. Ye (the apostles) also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. - MATT xix. 28.

8. - Does the establishment of “the Kingdom of God” require the return of the Jews? Answer. Certainly it does.

Proof. Where is he that is born King of the Jews? - MATT. n. 2. Bethlehem Ephratah, out of thee shall he come forth unto me to be ruler in Israel. - Mi. v. 2. And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever. - LUKE i. 82, 88. What shall the receiving of them (Israel) be, but life from the dead. - ROM. xi. 15.

9. “The Kingdom of God” then will consist of Israel and all other nations ruled by Jesus the Christ? Answer. It will.

Proof. Rejoice, ye Gentiles with his people, And again, Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles, and laud him, all ye people. And he shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; and in him shall the Gentiles trust. -
- ROM. xv. 10, 11, 12.

10. - What is to be understood by the phrase “the Name of Jesus Christ?” Answer. The meaning of the name Jesus Christ is Anointed Saviour. The things of the Name may be briefly expressed in the two great facts of the Gospel - the Death and Resurrection of Christ.

Proof. Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.—MATT. i. 21. Thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed (Christed).—ACTS iv. 27.

11. - Who was Jesus Christ? Answer. The only begotten Son of God.

Proof. For that which is begotten (see margin) in her is of the Holy Spirit. - MATT. i. 20.

12. - Was this Only Begotten Son stained with sin? Answer, By no means.

Proof. Who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. - HEB. vii. 26. In him is no sin - I JOHN in. 5.

13. - How does He save His people from their sins? Answer. By becoming a voluntary sacrifice for them; their sins being first “laid on him.”

Proof. He is the propitiation for our sins. - I JOHN n. 2. So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.—HEB. ix. 28.

14. - Does this complete the saving? Answer. No. Resurrection to eternal life must follow.

Proof. All which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. - JOHN vi. 89. If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. - 1 COR. xv. 16, 18.

15. - What sins were “laid on” Christ? Answer. All the sins that had been, or would be committed; except that sin which is unpardonable.

- Proof. Not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. - 1 JOHN n. 2. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it.—Chap. v. 16.
16. - What is sin? Answer. “Sin is the transgression of law,” either in act or intention.
Proof. For sin is the transgression of the law.—1 JOHN in. 4. Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.—MATT. v. 28.
17. How did sin enter our world? Answer. “By one man,” Adam.
Proof. By one man sin entered into the world.—ROM. v. 12.
18. - What follows sin? Answer. Death.
Proof. And death by sin.—ROM. v. 12. The wages of sin is death.— ROM. vi. 23.
19. - And what is death? Answer. Death is the return of the body to dust, and the destruction of consciousness.
Proof. Dust thou art, and unto dust shall thou return.—GEN. in. 19-The dead know not anything.—ECCL. ix. 5. In that very day his thoughts perish.—PSA. CXLVI. 4.
20. - Did Jesus overcome death? Answer. He did.
Proof. - Who hath abolished death. and hath brought life and incorruptibility to light.—2. TIM. i. 10.
21. - In what manner did Jesus “abolish death.” Answer. By avoiding all sin; by pouring out his blood as an offering for the sins of others; by rising on the third day and being changed to incorruptible, living, substance.
Proof - —Who did no sin. - 1. PET. u. 22. He hath poured out his soul unto death. - ISA. mi. 12. He rose again the third day. - 1 Cor. xv. 4. I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold. I am alive for evermore. - REV. i. 18.
22. - What then is the life promised in the Gospel? Answer. It is the same as that now enjoyed by Jesus Christ himself, namely, an immortal bodily existence.
Proof. We shall be like him. - 1 JOHN in. 2. Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, - PHILIP, iii. 21.
- 23.—And what is the “inheritance?” Answer. The earth on which we now live.
Proof. The meek shall inherit the earth.—PSA. xxxvii 11; MATT. v. 5.
- 24.—What is required of us in order that we may obtain these things? Answer. We must understand and believe them; and then be baptized into the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins that are past.
Proof. When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.—ACTS viii. 12. Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.—Chap. 11. 88.
- 25.—Does obedience terminate with baptism? Answer. No;
It only begins. We are required to observe all the ordinances of the Lord.
Proof. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.—MATT. xxviii., 20.
- 26.—To what ordinances do you refer? Answer. (1) The ordinance of assembling together on the first day of the week. (2) The eating of bread and the drinking of wine in remembrance of Christ’s death and resurrection. (3) The singing of psalms or hymns. (4) The offering up of prayer and thanksgiving. (5) Mutual exhortation. (6) The remembering of the poor.
Proof. (1) The first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread. - ACTS xx. 7. (2) This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.- 1 COR. xi. 25. (3) And when they had sung an hymn, or psalm. - MATT. xxvi. 30. (4) I exhort that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men. - 1 TEM. n. 1. (5) Exhorting one another.—HEB. x. 25. (6) Touching the ministering to the saints. - 2 COR. ix. 1. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give. - Verse 7.

27.—While thus living what is the Christian's chief expectation? Answer. The appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ to set up the universal kingdom over which He will appoint him a portion.

Proof. To serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven. - 1 THES. i. 9, 10. Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom. - 2 TIM. iv. 1. Joint heirs with Christ. - ROM. viii. 17. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.—MATT. xiii. 43.

Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.- JUDE.

THE AUTHOR.